THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

ANYONE who has to work with people will readily admit that no person is understandable apart from his background. A child cannot be understood without a knowledge of its parentage and of the home in which he was brought up. A man's statements and his general outlook on life are seldom intelligible without some knowledge of the factors and influences which made that man what he is. What is true of people is also true of institutions; and it is true of the Christian Church. The New Testament itself only becomes vividly alive when it is set against and within its background.

However desirable it is to know that background, it is not easy to know it. It is a wide background, which demands a knowledge of many subjects; and the materials to know it are not readily accessible to all. Dr. C. K. BARRETT has presented us with a book for which every teacher will be grateful, and which will be of inestimable profit to the general reader. The book is *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents*.[1] Although Dr. BARRETT supplies apt and illuminating commentary the great virtue of this book is that the documents are allowed to speak for themselves. The various sections of material which are brought under tribute consist of The Roman Empire, The Papyri, Inscriptions, The Philosophers, The Hermetic Literature, The Mystery Religions, Jewish History, Rabbinic Literature and Rabbinic Judaism, Philo, Josephus, The Septuagint, and Apocalyptic. The section which best suits our purposes is the section on The Philosophers.

By the time Christianity had arrived in this world, speculative philosophy was practically at an end. Man had lost confidence in himself and was suffering from what Gilbert Murray called the 'failure of nerve.' Interest in metaphysic was gone and the clamant question was—how is a virtuous man to live in evil surroundings?

Dr. BARRETT starts far back with Heraclitus, for in Heraclitus the conception of the *Logos* first appears. 'Though the word always exists men are without understanding, both before they heard it, and after they have heard it for the first time. For though all things happen in accordance with this word, men seem as if they had no acquaintance with them.'

Then we take a step down the centuries and we come to Socrates. Socrates' insistence was that men should question every conventional and unexamined motive, that they should examine themselves and their presuppositions. 'Socrates taught men to know themselves, and in that knowledge to discover their own ignorance.' Socrates addresses his judges in words strangely prophetic of those which Peter and John were one day to use: 'Men of Athens, I honour and love you; but I shall obey God rather than you, and while I have life and strength I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy.' 'I do nothing but go about persuading you all, old and young alike, not to take thought for your persons or your properties, but first and chiefly to care about the greatest improvements of the soul.'

Next we meet the Stoics with their conception of the all-pervading reason and purpose of God, the Divine *logos*. There is nobility in the great hymn of Cleanthes:

Thou, O Zeus, art praised above all gods; many are thy names, and thine is all power for ever.
The beginning of the world was from thee: and with law thou rulest over all things.
Unto thee may all flesh speak: for we are thy offspring.
There will I raise a hymn unto thee; and will ever sing of thy power.
The whole order of the heavens obeyeth thy word: as it moveth around the earth. . . .
Nor is anything done upon earth apart from thee: nor in the firmament nor in the seas:
Save that which the wicked do: by their own folly.
Thine is the skill to set even the crooked straight.

[1] S.P.C.K.; 21s. net.

There is a kind of grim horror in the Stoic cyclic conception of history. According to Stoic thought the world undergoes a periodic destruction and a periodic renewal in which the same things happen all over again. 'Socrates and Plato and each individual man will live again, with the same friends and fellow-citizens. They will go through the same experiences and the same activities. Every city and village and field will be restored just as it was.' So far from things being made new, things were ever being made the same.

It may be said that Stoicism reached its highest peak in Stoic ethics. Epictetus called on men to praise God: 'Ought we not as we dig and plough and eat to sing the hymn to God? "Great is God that he gave us these instruments wherewith we till the earth. Great is God that he has given us hands, and power to swallow, and a belly, and the power to grow without knowing it, and to draw our breath in sleep." . . . If indeed I were a nightingale, I should sing as a nightingale, if a swan, as a swan: but as I am a rational creature I must praise God. This is my task, and I do it: and I will not abandon this duty, so long as it is given to me.' 'No bad man lives as he would, and so no bad man is free.' 'The road that leads to freedom, the only release from slavery is this, to be able to say with your whole soul:

> Lead me, Zeus, and lead me, Destiny,
> Whither ordained is by your decree.'

The parallel school of thought was that of the Epicureans. It was Epicurus' belief that all the evils of life were due to fear, fear of death and fear of the gods. His aim therefore was to release men from the popular religious beliefs of their day. 'Epicurus was a saviour—from religion.' As Lucretius writes:

When man's life upon earth in base dismay,
Crushed by the burthen of Religion, lay,
Whose face from all the regions of the sky,
Hung, glaring hate upon mortality,
First one Greek man against her dared to raise
His eyes, against her strive through all his days . . .
Till underfoot is tamed religion trod,
And, by his victory, man ascends to God.

Epicurus himself said: 'The impious man is not he who denies the gods of the many, but he who attaches to the gods the beliefs of the many.' Epicurus was the liberator who sought to free men from the fears of the superstitions which were called religion. It is the strange fate of Epicurus that his name has become a synonym for that which he never taught. It is true that Epicurus declared the end of life to be pleasure; but he himself said: 'When, therefore, we maintain that pleasure is the end, we do not mean the pleasures of the profligates and those which consist in sensuality . . . but freedom from pain in the body and trouble in the mind.' And for that very reason for Epicurus the only real pleasure was never the pleasure of the moment, but always the pleasure which brought ultimate good.

It may well be that the most interesting and the most important of all the figures in the contemporary background of early Christianity was that of the Philosophic Missionary. 'The teachers of philosophy saw their own beliefs as the needed cure for men's ills and proceeded to offer them to the public. The philosopher became a street corner orator, and the Cynics in particular preached their "gospel" to all who would listen, and it was often delivered—and received less as a reasoned system of beliefs about the universe than as a divine revelation.' It was the appeal of Epictetus: 'Oh race of men, whither are you hurrying? What are you doing, miserable creatures? You wander up and down like blind folk: you have left the true path and go away upon a vain errand, you seek peace and happiness elsewhere, where it is not to be found, and believe not when another shows the way.' When Apollonius of Tyana was asked how a sage should converse, he answered: 'Like a law-giver, for it is the duty of the law-giver to deliver to the many the instructions of the truth of which he has persuaded himself.' The ancient world knew the sermon before the Christian preachers come upon the scene. When we see the picture of that world contemporary with the rise of Christianity we see a world looking as Seneca said '*ad salutem*,' for salvation, and we see a world prepared because it was a world in search.

Dr. BARRETT has given us a book of immense value. It is a book which covers a very wide field. The danger which any man runs in digging in a wide field is that his digging is almost bound to be shallow; but in this book that danger is completely avoided, for Dr. BARRETT has rendered the very greatest service—he has allowed antiquity to speak for itself.

The Book of Psalms has received much attention in recent years, especially since the work of Gunkel and Mowinckel, but a book which is not concerned with a detailed, critical study of the Psalms and is not primarily interested in the dating of them or in their associations with religious festivals, but is

explicitly a theological approach to the study of them, is notable.[1] Most theologies of the New Testament are written in sections, dealing with the theology of the Synoptic Gospels, of the Fourth Gospel, of the Pauline Epistles and so forth ; but this book essays a theological approach to the Book of Psalms as a whole, in spite of the fact that the range of the Psalms in date may cover ten centuries, because the author believes that they have a universal applicability which transcends, and is unimpeded by, any questions of dating.

In reply to a quotation from W. E. Barnes to the effect that ' in the Psalms we see religion at work in everyday life but of formal theology hardly a trace,' Dr. GUNN affirms that there is always a theology behind piety and that piety is theology come to life. That can be so, but need it be so in the strict sense ? Is it not true that piety may be born of religious experience, which may have saved a person from frustration and misdirected effort and have given him a new sense of spiritual vitality and of personal significance, but may not yet awhile work itself out into theological affirmation, let alone into a systematic theology ? It is surely possible for a man to feel spiritually renewed and to rejoice in a new-found health before he has formed any real conception of the nature of the therapeutic which has been applied to him or of the credentials of the healer.

But if Dr. GUNN may give at the beginning of his book the impression that he proposes a theological study of a Book of Psalms which is substantially uniform and whose ' simplicity is the simplicity of pure poetry and of the high faith which inspires it,' he gives later intimations that his task is not so simple. Sometimes he has to speak of primitive, pre-prophetic ideas of God in the Psalms, sometimes of exceptional thoughts which stand high above the prevailing level. When he says that in the presence of Israel's sufferings ' isolated phrases and verses in some Psalms seem to have surrendered to the view that God was doing nothing, whereas their real and constant thought on the matter is that there is not, and can never be, a breakdown from the side of God,' he gives the impression that he is ironing out an uneven surface, or treading upon heights and leaving comparatively unnoticed the struggles of fumbling, pedestrian folk in the valleys below.

He shows rightly that the Psalms, in celebrating Nature, contain no Nature poems as such, but speak of the fringes of God's ways, so that they evoke, not only the sense of wonder before that which visibly and audibly is, but the attitude of reverence before Him whose glory is revealed in all His works. That being so, the transition from celebrating this God to proclaiming the God who demands truth and righteousness is progressive ; the God of Nature is also Saviour and Lord, while man the creature is called to seek God and live.

In a chapter on the Divine conflict with evil, Dr. GUNN starts justifiably from the affirmation that according to the Bible the conflict between good and evil is of the essence of human history. He then says that the Bible believes that there is an irrational element in the very nature of man. Does the Bible as a whole speak in this way ? The Book of Proverbs describes the sinner frequently as a fool, as one who despises wisdom ; but the prophets describe human sin variously, as due to ignorance, or deceit, or moral perversion, or a harlot spirit, or a narrow vision which makes men think that they can secure their own welfare ; but the word irrational does not fit every case.

There are in the Psalms examples of belief in the prosperity of the faithful and in the face of the problem of suffering the author of Ps 37 ' is almost over-confident and commits himself to some " awkward affirmations " ' so that he seems not to face the seemingly intractable facts of human experience ; but there are other Psalms which can look out upon the whole pattern of human suffering and yet breathe an atmosphere of trust and confidence in the assurance that God will not utterly and finally forsake His own. In this connexion it must be suggested that when Dr. GUNN says that ' in an ultimate sense it is as impossible to have prosperity without obedience as it is to have literature without an alphabet,' his words may be misleading, because the reader may not give to the first phrase the value that it is meant to have. Often in the Psalms there is an expectation of prosperity for the faithful ; it took man a long time to regard adversity as a possible blessing and, under God, to make it so.

In respect of the Messianic hope Dr. GUNN gives it as his view that it took its origin probably within the circle of those who upheld the ancient attitude of suspicion to the king on religious grounds, rather than among those who regarded kingship as a good institution. Yet it may have received a strong stimulus, if not its originating impulse, in quite a different way, in the thought that in 701 Jerusalem was saved not by Judah's king or Judah's might, but in a wonderful deliverance by ' the angel of

[1] Dr. George S. Gunn, *God in the Psalms* (St. Andrew Press ; 21s. net).

the Lord ' and in Isaiah's vision of the heavenly throne, symbol of the Kingdom that has no end, and, later, in the return of the Jews from the Babylonian exile by the triumph of Cyrus, the Lord's anointed, and Zechariah's vision of the rebuilt city of Jerusalem without walls. Such a series of events must have turned men's hopes from vainglorious kings and armies and have induced them to rest in the power and purpose of God.

The final chapter of the book will come with freshness to many readers. It deals with fulfilment in worship and is concerned, *inter alia*, with the transition from the profoundly ethical conception of sin in the pre-exilic prophets to the priestly conception of sin as due to inadvertence or ignorance in the period after the Exile. This seems a very serious descent. The priests, it would appear, bypassed ' the inexorable challenges of the prophets and looked to tradition for a more primitive rule of conduct for the returned community in Judah ; but the cult-prophets saved the situation and prevented that hardening into legalism which is the danger of the priest in every age.' And that was but part of the saving work of these prophets ; their other was in the influence they exerted in the compilation of the Psalter.

This book will open up many lines of thought and will make readers take up their Psalters again ; it can be read with justice to the author and with full appreciation of what he seeks to say only when the Psalter lies open for constant reference.

Exposition and Encounter : Preaching in the Context of Worship, by Professor James S. STEWART, D.D.[1] is the 1956 Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture. There can be nothing more useful than to listen to a master craftsman communicating his secrets in so far as these secrets are communicable. The Bible is not *good advice* ; it is *good news*. It is not primarily to be admired, discussed, criticized, demythologized. It is the word in which God encounters us with incomparable blessings in His hand. A missionary once asked an African woman about her understanding of the gospel. She replied : ' Sir, it is not I who am reading this Book. It is this Book that is reading me.' Expository preaching, in which diligent study makes the Bible speak for itself, alone can save us from ' topical disquisitions, philosophical speculations, diagnoses of the human predicament, Pelagian exhortations, ephemeral homilies, essays of religious uplift.' Preaching takes place in the context of worship, which William Temple claimed to be the most important thing in the world, because, ' to worship is to quicken the conscience by the holiness of God, to feed the mind with the truth of God, to purge the imagination by the beauty of God, to open the heart to the love of God, to devote the will to the purpose of God.' Dr. STEWART finishes with a challenge and a warning to the preacher. We cannot preach what we have not seen ; and only the pure in heart shall see God. There are only sixteen pages in this book but, for the preacher, every page is a light to illumine the mind and a flame to challenge the heart.

[1] Berean Press ; 2s. net.

For eleven years Professor Rowley has unselfishly given up time to edit the annual Book List of the Society for Old Testament Study. The *1956 Book List* is his last one—he now hands over to the Reverend G. W. Anderson of St. Andrews University.

With his panel of reviewers, each reviewer an expert in his own field, Dr. Rowley has produced year by year a *Book List* quite indispensable for any one who wants to keep up-to-date with work on the Old Testament and related subjects.

The reviews in the *1956 Book List* occupy seventy-seven pages and they are classified under the following headings—General, Educational, Archaeology and Epigraphy, History and Geography, Text and Versions, Exegesis and Modern Translations, Literary Criticism and Introduction (including History of Interpretation, Canon, and Special Studies), Law, Religion and Theology, The Life and Thought of the Neighbouring People, The Dead Sea Scrolls, Apocrypha and Post-Biblical Judaism, and Philology and Grammar. The *Book List* may be obtained from D. R. Ap-Thomas, Esq., Llansadwrn, Menai Bridge, Anglesey, at a cost of 6s. which we consider will be money very well spent.

Expository Problems

Man Created in the Image of God

By Herbert G. Wood, D.D., Birmingham

'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. . . . And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.'—Gn $1^{26.\ 27}$ (R.V.).

How are we to understand this creation of man in the image of God? In what ways is man supposed to be like his Maker? Is there a distinction between the phrases 'in our image' and 'after our likeness'? Does any importance attach to the omission of 'after his likeness' from *v.* 27? Though, as we shall see, Origen distinguished the two expressions, he was mistaken so far as the linguistic usage of the writer in Genesis is concerned, since the phrase missing from Gn 1^{27} is found in Gn 5^{1}. 'In the day that God created man, in the *likeness* of God made he him.' No distinction is drawn between 'image' and 'likeness.'

Where, then, are we to look for the image or likeness of God in man? The prophet Muggleton saw the image of God in the outward physical form of man. God Himself exists in a form that resembles man. Though it is difficult to believe that the writer in Genesis intended his words to be understood in this crass, literalist way, Muggleton was not without excuse. In Gn 5^{3} we read that 'Adam . . . begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.' The likeness of father and son might not be confined to physical features, but would certainly include them. We to-day look for the resemblance of man to God in the powers of man's mind rather than in the structure of his body. Yet we must remember that the creation story asserts *homo, imago Dei*, not *homo sapiens, imago Dei*.

Was William Blake mistaken when he wrote of 'the human form divine'? At least, the body itself provides symbols which we use naturally in thinking and speaking of God. Take, for example, the hand, which is physically one of man's distinctive characteristics, and with which his higher life is intimately associated. With the hand man creates, and his tools add to the creative power of his hands. So when prophet and psalmist speak of God as creating, they constantly refer to 'the work of God's hands.' 'His hands formed the dry land'; 'Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands.' 'Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel and his Maker, Ask me of the things to come concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands command ye me. I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, *even my hands*, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded' (Is $45^{11.\ 12}$). Man, too, is part of creation, 'we all are the work of thy hand' (Is 64^{8}). 'Thy hands have made me and fashioned me' (Ps 119^{73}). It is noteworthy that these expressions suggest that God is intimately involved in the very process of creation. In particular, the care and as it were the touch of God are thought to be involved in the process of human birth. 'My frame was not hidden from thee, When I was made in secret. . . . Thine eyes did see my unperfect substance, And in thy book were all my members written, Which day by day were fashioned, When as yet there was none of them' (Ps $139^{15.\ 16}$). Job, protesting that he has not despised or wronged any of his servants, recalls their common humanity in these terms: 'Did not he that made me in the womb make him? And did not one fashion us in the womb?' So creation is not simply God's majestic fiat, not simply God speaking a world from nought. It is rather the work of God's hands. Indeed the poet of Ps 8 goes further and says, 'When I consider thy heavens, the work *of thy fingers*,' suggesting as it were the delicate discriminating touch of God's hands in the work of creation. Did not Elizabeth Barrett Browning, writing a line descriptive of our Midland scenery with its low hills and gentle undulations, say it was

> As if God's finger touched but did not press
> In making England?

It would be absurd to suppose that psalmist and prophet shared Muggleton's literalism. They know well enough that God has not hands and fingers, but such expressions as 'the work of God's hands' convey the truth that Nature is God's art, and that God's artistic designs and loving care are to be found in all His works. That men are the work of God's hands becomes a moving ground of appeal in prayer. 'Despise not, forsake not the work of Thine hands.'

When we read in Genesis that man was created in the image of God, the writer is asserting man's unique status in creation. It is not that God and man have hands in common, but that God has formed man to share with Him His delight in

creating and in the things created. Moreover God has entrusted man with dominion over the works of His hands, and part of God's purpose for man in creation is that man may exercise that dominion and learn to exercise it aright. Though he is a part of Nature, man is like God in that he can yet stand apart from Nature, stand above it, judge it and within strict limits, refashion it. Man is the great amphibium, as Sir Thomas Browne rightly said. Man is created to live in two worlds. In him the natural and the supernatural are combined, the dust of the earth associated with the life-breath of God. Scientific knowledge, both theoretical and applied, is an essential part of man's spiritual inheritance. Man's possession of free general ideas, on which his power to invent depends, marks him out from the rest of the animal world, and is evidence of his Divine sonship. Beyond the power of thought is man's instinctive desire to pray and give thanks. 'I *pray*, therefore I am,' as a maid-servant in an Italian novel asserts, is a profounder saying than the aphorism of Descartes, 'I *think*, therefore I am.' The saving grace of humour is rightly so called. Humour frees us from bondage to circumstances. Laughter, said Hobbes, is a sudden glory, and T. E. Brown adds :

> Nay, 'tis a Godlike function ; laugh thy fill !
> Mirth comes to thee unsought ;
> Mirth sweeps before it like a flood the mill
> Of languaged logic ; thought
> Hath not its source so high ;
> The will
> Must let it by :
> For though the heavens are still,
> God sits upon His hill,
> And sees the shadows fly ;
> And if He laughs at fools, why should He not ?

This, then, is the kind of direction in which to look for an understanding and verification of the truth asserted in Gn 1^{26}.

If this account of the *imago Dei* in man be correct, it has often been obscured and even denied in Christian thought. Sometimes it is supposed that this imprint of the image of God on man has not only been defaced but actually effaced by the Fall. This apparently was Luther's view. 'Luther is so concerned to re-establish the Augustinian doctrine of original sin against the semi-Pelagianism of Catholicism that all his interpretations of the image of God are coloured by his eagerness to prove that, whatever the image is, it is now lost. Wherefore when we now attempt to speak of the image we speak of a thing unknown, an image which we have not only not experienced, but the contrary to which we have experienced all our lives and experience still. Of this image, therefore, all we now possess are the mere words "image of God." '[1] But we need not go back to Luther. In his essay on *The Incarnation and Principles of Evidence* R. H. Hutton, in a more moderate fashion, criticised the semi-Pelagianism of the Unitarians among whom he was brought up. He is not actually discussing the theme 'man created in the image of God' and he is not declaring with Luther that the image is lost, but he is questioning the optimistic humanism which has so often been grounded on the Creation-myth. Hutton feels that the fuller knowledge of God throws into relief the contradictions of human nature. 'The knowledge we have gained either humiliates and crushes us, or produces an artificial elation. We either crouch with the highest of purely Jewish minds, or become urbanely self-content with the Pelagian-Unitarian thinkers. We either cry, "Woe is me ! for I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips, and dwell amongst a people of unclean lips ; for mine eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts ! " or we congratulate ourselves that we are, by inherent right, children of God, "born good," as Lord Palmerston said, and have no profound need, therefore, of purification at all. The humiliation alone, and the exaltation alone, are alike false to the facts within us and destructive of the true springs of human hope.' Hutton commends to us the saying of Athanasius, 'We are not *by nature* sons of God, but the Son in us makes us so ; also God is not *by nature our* Father, but He is the Father of the Word, dwelling in us ; for in Him and through Him we cry, "Abba, Father." '

We can appreciate the desire of Athanasius and of R. H. Hutton, who is in this his disciple, to emphasise the unique significance of the new humanity which is being created in and through Christ. To safeguard this truth, Karl Barth insists on the absolute otherness of God and, as Reinhold Niebuhr says, 'finds [even] Augustine's definitions of the image of God in man [in terms of mind or reason] very inconvenient.' Yet it ought not to be necessary to deny the kinship of man with God through creation in God's image in order to assert man's need of purification and of re-creation in the likeness of Christ. And it is impossible to deny that the exaltation of human nature is as firmly rooted in the highest of purely Jewish minds as is the humiliation. Reverence for the spirit of man is as manifest as the deep sense of unworthiness in the presence of the Holy God. Nor does this appreciation of man's status in creation and in relation to God belong only to the opening of Genesis and disappear after the myth of the Fall. The verse in Ps 8, 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him ? ' may perhaps be interpreted as

[1] Cf. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, i. 171.

the poet's sense of wonder at the mystery of man's greatness. In any case, he proceeds to recall Genesis, ch. 1, and recognizes the royal dignity bestowed on man. Man's dominion over the works of God's hands has not been cancelled by the Fall. When James expounds the difficulty of controlling the tongue, he notes among the more serious lapsus linguae that 'therewith curse we men, which are made after the likeness of God.' He takes this truth seriously, and does not say with Luther that all we now possess of the likeness of God are the mere words!

'The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man' was a lively inspiring watchword in the days when the Adult School and Brotherhood movements flourished in Britain. To-day, the watchword is a discarded slogan and few sing the verse:

> The grandest words that men have heard
> Since ere the world began,
> They are the Fatherhood of God,
> The Brotherhood of man.

It is true that apart from Christ, Divine Fatherhood and human Brotherhood lack depth and reality, and yet both have roots in creation and in this regard grace perfects Nature. The actual expressions, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, do not occur in the Scriptures, yet they do not lack a Scriptural basis. They are implicit in the Creation story and when Paul on Mars Hill asserted that God has made of one stock all the nations or races of man, and when he cites with approval sayings from Greek poets—'in him we live, and move, and have our being,' and 'we are also his offspring,' he may be speaking the language of Stoic humanism, but he does not find it alien from the gospel. There is a sense in which God is *by nature* our Father and all men His sons by virtue of their creation in His image.

Reverence for personality is rooted in the truth of creation. The value of men and women is enhanced indefinitely by the fact that Christ died for us all, but even apart from the redemption in Christ, man's status in the natural order compels respect for mind and heart. Man is endowed with the capacity to respond consciously and of his own self-determination to God's appeals to him through Nature and through history. And God seeks man's free, *i.e.*, man's self-determined response, and that is why the Christ came, 'to draw men not to drive them, to persuade and not to compel.' Perhaps one might add, 'to persuade and not to overpersuade, to convince and not to indoctrinate.' It was one of John Oman's main contentions that truth in religion must be arrived at by the same honesty of judgment as is required for attaining trustworthy knowledge in natural science. So he wrote in *Grace and Personality*[4] (p. 12): 'If on all other subjects we have found the only basis of truth which can bring us to final agreement to be the same witness of the reality to each one, religion is not likely to be an exception, seeing that in religion, as in nothing else, our whole spiritual worth is involved in believing only what we see to be true and following only what we discern to be right, and that the ground of this faith in man as the measure of truth and righteousness is the religious conviction that God made man in His own image, so that there is no place where this confidence has more right than in religion.' One may be surprised at Oman's use of the phrase 'man as the measure of truth and righteousness,' when one remembers Plato's criticism of Protagoras and his aphorism, 'Man is the measure of all things,' and when one recalls how often this idea of man as the measure has issued in subjectivism and relativism. But presumably Oman meant faith or trust in man's responsibility to judge for himself in regard to truth and righteousness. Reason and conscience must be respected and not over-ridden.

If we refuse to follow Luther in regarding the image of God as entirely lost, we shall none the less recognize that the image has been impaired and disfigured by man's sin and wilfulness. A passage in the Wisdom of Solomon (2^{23}) assumes that the loss resulting from the Fall is the loss of immortality. 'Because God created man for incorruption, and made him an image of his own proper being [or everlastingness]; But by the envy of the devil death entered into the world, and they that are of his portion make trial thereof.' If this account of the image of God in man be accepted, then Luther might be justified. The image in this sense has been lost. Conditional immortality appears to be the Biblical doctrine. But the writer of Gn 1 did not attach this meaning to the image of God, nor need we. The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord. The image abides in man's power of judgment and decision, and in his ability to create. Yet this power is warped by prejudice and prostituted for evil purposes, and so long as man misuses his powers and fails to respond to God in sincerity and truth, he may still retain something of the image of God, but is far from realizing God's likeness. So at least Origen understood the human situation, pressing the distinction between image and likeness. He wrote in *De Principiis*, bk. 3, ch. 6, section 1, the following passage: The highest good . . . is to become as far as possible like God . . . For Moses points to it when in recording the first creation of man he says, 'And God said, Let us make man in our own image and likeness.' Then he adds afterwards: 'And God made man; in the image of God made he him; male and female made he them and he

blessed them.' Now the fact that he said, 'He made him in the image of God,' and was silent about the likeness, points to nothing else but this, that man received the honour of God's image in his first creation, whereas the perfection of God's likeness was reserved for him at the consummation. The purpose of this was that man should acquire it for himself by his own earnest efforts to imitate God, so that while the possibility of attaining perfection was given to him in the beginning through the honour of the 'image' he should in the end through the accomplishment of these works obtain for himself the perfect 'likeness.' [1]

There is a similar suggestion in a charming tradition from the Talmud, included by Victor Gollancz in *More for Timothy* (p. 43). 'And Isaac asked the Eternal-King of the world, "When Thou didst make the light, Thou didst say in Thy Torah that the light was good; when Thou didst make the firmament and the extent of the earth, Thou didst say in Thy Torah, that they were good; and every herb and every beast, Thou hast said that they were good; but when Thou hast made man in Thine image, Thou didst not say in Thy Torah that man was good. Wherefore, Lord?" And God answered him, "Because man I have not yet perfected and because man is to perfect himself and to perfect the world".'

From the expressions used by Origen and in this passage from the Talmud, we might be led into the mistake of supposing that likeness to God is to be man's achievement in virtue of his possession of the image of God. We should then fall back into Pelagianism. But in this pursuit of perfection we are to be co-workers with God and co-heirs with Christ. We approach our goal as we 'put on the new man which is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him' (Col 3^{10}). The new humanity is being created in Christ who is the image of the unseen God (Col 1^{15}). Christ is what God meant man to be or to become. Through Christ God's original purpose for man in creation can be fulfilled.

Part at least of what it means to be transformed into the same image (2 Co 3^{18}), the image of the new humanity in Christ, is happily suggested by Blake's verse:

> For Mercy, Pity, Peace, and Love
> Is God, our Father dear,
> And Mercy, Pity, Peace, and Love
> Is man, His Child and care.

[1] Cf. *Origen on First Principles*, tr. by G. W. Butterworth, p. 245.

Literature

MEDIEVAL THEOLOGY

RECENT progress in applied science and technology has induced both arrogance and humility. In so far as we are proud of what we are achieving we tend to despise our forefathers, but as we come to feel less happy about our new world we turn with admiration to other ways in which situations have been faced. For the satisfied the word 'medieval' is a term of contempt, while for others it suggests all that is lovely and of good report. There seems to be no absolute standard for civilizations or epochs, and we judge largely by our own experience. But those who do retreat to the Middle Ages and particularly to the twelfth century and who live themselves into its atmosphere develop a passionate devotion at least as strong as any modern zealot for scientific advance can manifest. An apologetic for the period is offered by the latest volume of 'The Library of Christian Classics' (volume 10) which is entitled *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham*, and is edited and translated (with some assistance from other scholars) by Professor E. R. Fairweather of the University of Toronto (S.C.M.; 35s. net). There is a suitable general introduction on 'The Intellectual Achievement of Medieval Christendom.' Selections follow from Anselm and twelfth century theologians with a small addendum of later documents of a non-Thomist character, valuable introductions being supplied with each section. Excerpts from John of Salisbury, Peter Abailard, and several of the St. Victor writers are included. There are interesting and learned notes and adequate bibliographies. The volume as a whole provides an attractive approach to medieval theology, and lays a foundation upon which further studies might be built. The scholarship is obvious and is such as to give confidence to the reader without adding to his difficulties.

One would hesitate to suggest that this theology of the Middle Ages was its chief glory, but it is a natural part of the balanced whole which that period presents. It attempts for its time all that can be done for any time, on the prevailing assumptions and within the available categories seeking to justify the reality revealed in experience. There seems to be a great gulf fixed between such thinkers and ourselves as to both problems and methods, but human nature does not change and

these efforts are perhaps not always so irrelevant for us as their form may suggest. They certainly deserve more sympathetic and expectant attention than Protestants tend to give them.

G. D. HENDERSON

REFORMATION THEOLOGY

Professor T. F. Torrance's work is always well deserving of careful study, always bearing the mark of a learned, profound, and original mind. He has the defects of great virtues—a compression of style which is sometimes needlessly intricate. He is better as a systematic than an historical theologian, for he has never really learned to use a stethoscope to the past, but always rushes in so eagerly with his own thoughts.

Bearing these things in mind, *Kingdom and Church : A Study in the Theology of the Reformation* (Oliver and Boyd ; 16s. net) is an important and welcome study. Every paragraph in the opening essay on Luther is worth pondering carefully. I think the weakness is in using eschatology as a *Grundmotiv* and that his essay proves that it is in fact a most inadequate key to Luther. He does not get Luther's doctrine of the *larvæ dei* quite right, as Alice would say. And the essay breaks down curiously and unexpectedly in being unable to link Luther's doctrine of church and kingdom to justification and to faith. About Bucer he has written the first accessible essay in English on Bucer's theology but again is over eager to claim him for the Reformed tradition : this ignores the recent work of Strohl who has shown how much Bucer had in common with the early Luther : more seriously it ignores the cardinal, blessed fact about Bucer that his creative years were spent before there was a formal Protestantism, either Lutheran or Reformed, and that he represents the only attempt at a Continental *via media*.

I find Dr. Torrance's use of ' Butzer ' for Bucer irritating and wish there were ecumenical shop stewards to report him to. If he wants to go on using this ugly name, he must print it in Gothic type, which will hide its inelegant nakedness. More seriously, he gives as an illustration of Bucer's debt to Calvin a Christocentric reference to Predestination which Bucer expounded while Calvin was a teenager. The essay on Calvin whose ' eschatology of hope ' is contrasted with that of Luther on faith, and Bucer on love, is the most successful though in the light of Quistorp's discussion of the same subject I think there is more Hellenism in the ' Psychopannychia ' than Dr. Torrance will admit. There are a few wild generalizations which appear to me to be most improbable, even as half-truths, while at one point Dr. Torrance's enthusiasm for his subject leads him not only to expound Calvin's writings but to tell us what Calvin (' I feel sure ') might have written about the Apocalypse, had he ever done so. But it is a merit of this fine study that it gives one furiously to think, and to turn to the evidence which is provided in a royal abundance of citations.

GORDON RUPP

A FRESH PERSPECTIVE IN THEOLOGY

Professor H. D. Lewis has complained, with some justice, that ' the dominant trend in Protestant theology to-day is altogether at variance with elementary ethical principles which we take for granted from day to day, and which the moral philosopher seeks to describe and correlate.' The issue is taken up by Professor N. H. G. Robinson, D.Litt., of St. Andrews, in a cogent and provocative work of theological criticism—*Christ and Conscience* (Nisbet ; 17s. 6d. net)—arguing that no Christian theology can be adequate which is not thoroughly ethical and that there is no reason why such cannot be equally evangelical. ' The claim of Christ is a moral claim indeed, but it is a moral claim which renews the whole moral world with all its claims and counterclaims and rebuilds it around Himself as centre. . . . It is to our hearts that Christ speaks and our consciences provide the point of contact.'

In pointing out the inconsistency of those who despise human goodness, in order to safeguard the need of grace, but take human badness very seriously, Dr. Robinson exposes the weakness of the ' Barthian ' tendency to discard moral values but to use moral terms. In the last analysis the judgment of God operates through the medium of man's conscience and consent, and finally in relation to his own strict moral responsibility. ' Some modern theology may lose sight of the world to which Christ came, but God does not and Christ will not. . . . The Fellowship of the Holy Spirit is the most intimate moral relationship of all.'

Barthian theology is, indeed, genuinely evangelical but it is not to be identified with the whole of evangelical theology ; it is an evangelical theology coloured and governed by a metaphysical preconception as to the relationship between Creator and creature which aligns it with recent reactionary and authoritarian trends in social and political fields, even, and more significantly, with the radical empiricists. Here the author points out that those who owe much to Dr. Barth but are interested in ethical and political concerns have had, at some point or another, to stand against him. This is illustrated with reference to Brunner and Niebuhr, and then related to P. T. Forsyth whose constant endeavour was to outline a

theology equally ethical and evangelical. He opposed rationalism but did not deny reason. Herein he is as much a corrective to, as an anticipation of, Barth.

From this criticism emerges the 'ethico-evangelical' perspective which Dr. Robinson seeks to identify, define, defend—a perspective from which can be seen the truth and errors of Liberalism, and the strength and weakness of Barthianism. The solid argument, demonstrating that a theology from which the ethical is excluded may cease to be evangelical, underlines the urgent need to base any system of theology on a proper synthesis between the evangelical and the ethical. The author does not attempt to outline any such system but the relation of his perspective, in the concluding chapters, to some of the main trends of modern thought is sufficient to illustrate the importance, and potentiality, of this valuable contribution to theological discussion.

MARCUS WARD

THE TRANSFIGURATION

Principal J. R. Macphail has written a short and very readable book for 'the ordinary layman' about the message of the Bible. The reader's curiosity is kindled by its peculiar title—*The Bright Cloud*—and still more by its sub-title, 'The Bible in the Light of the Transfiguration' (Oxford University Press; 15s. net).

The opening chapters expound the significance of the Transfiguration of Jesus. It is treated as the moment when His real significance flashes upon the minds of His disciples, and in a symbolic way 'the dazzling garments of Jesus . . . stand for the words of Scripture transfigured in the eyes of those who will climb the hill of discipleship.' Anticipations of the Transfiguration in the Old Testament and fulfilments of it in the Epistles of the New Testament are brought to our notice.

Then follows an interesting and unconventional presentation of the message of the Bible. First, Acts and the Pauline Epistles are dealt with; then the Old Testament patriarchs and prophets; and finally the Gospels. The treatment of the Biblical material is fresh and illuminated by vivid phrases.

As a book about the Bible it has much to commend it, but it must be confessed that the attempt to associate every part of the Bible with the theme of the Transfiguration is rather forced and unconvincing. Paul, for instance, is brought within its orbit because 'amid the horror and shame and bewilderment, which he faces steadily, . . . he sees also a glory, clouded at times but always there.' The Fourth Gospel, which is the subject of the last chapter, omits the account of the Transfiguration, but is nevertheless an illustration of the theme, because it is 'a perpetual theophany,' in it the Transfiguration is not a passing episode, but an enduring truth.

Not every reader will be persuaded of the validity of the author's claim that the Transfiguration is a key which unlocks the inner meaning of all the Scriptures. But everyone will find here illuminating insights, expressed in fresh and unconventional ways. We read, for instance: 'The doctrine of the Incarnation is like the sun: we can hardly bear to look at it direct. It is like the sun also in giving us light by which to see everything else' (p. 15). Concerning the discrepancies in the accounts of the resurrection of Jesus, he writes: 'The early Christians could have ironed out some of them, if they had felt they had a doubtful case to defend. . . . But they were content with imperfect but authentic mementoes. So you may treasure a snapshot of a happy picnic, though your best friend's head has been cut off: a little thing like that doesn't matter if you were there' (p. 153).

There are shrewd comments also on the inspiration of the Bible, the emergence in the Old Testament of belief in life after death, the use of apocalyptic language by Jesus, and many other relevant matters, and apt quotations from the books of many writers are introduced with great skill and effect.

C. L. MITTON

THE BIBLE AND ARCHÆOLOGY

The starting point of *The Bible as History*, by Dr. Werner Keller (Hodder and Stoughton; 25s. net), is that the Bible is not to be read only as *Heilsgeschichte*; it is to a large extent concerned with things that happened, and modern archæology has often served, on the one hand, to rebuke the attitude that has tended to regard many elements in the Old Testament record as the fanciful or pietistic creations of a comparatively late period in Israel's history, and, on the other, to fill in the New Testament background and even to confirm local details. It is inevitable that the book is concerned with the former much more than with the latter.

A chapter on 'The Coming of the Patriarchs' deals with the investigation of Tell el Muqayyar (Ur of the Chaldees), and is used to give an introduction to modern archæological method and materials, as well as to picture that city in its cultural context four thousand years ago. Again, with regard to the Biblical flood narrative, Dr. Keller is not carried away by a selection of the archæological evidence which has become available, but is careful to state that, as a whole, it bears testimony to a local flood in a limited area

north-west of the Persian Gulf; it may be objected that the evidence from Kish, which is a town within this delimited area, probably dates the flood to a later period than the evidence from Ur.

The Mari discoveries are used to illumine life in ancient Aram Naharaim, and Egyptian and other sources to fill out the picture of the Palestine which Abraham entered. There is no lack of evidence for the conquest of Palestine under Joshua, and the subsequent period of unsettlement until the establishment of the monarchy. The possibility that the word 'David' is a title ('commander' or 'general') is mentioned; in which case Elhanan may have been his personal name (otherwise, David may be a regnal name).

For each period as it comes, Dr. Keller makes very competent use of the discoveries of modern archæology, and can show how, with regard to a particular event or general background, the Biblical record is often confirmed and sometimes helpfully amplified.

With regard to the New Testament, he does not fail to deal carefully with the view that the village of Mataria may have been the place to which Joseph and Mary with their child Jesus, came when they fled into Egypt; but he can speak with more assurance of Capernaum by the Sea of Galilee, of the Pavement and the Ecce Homo arch in Jerusalem, of the ancient synagogues that have been excavated in Palestine, and of the Temple of Artemis in Ephesus.

Dr. Keller has an attractive narrative style, and a notable descriptive ability, which will make the reading of his book for many a pleasure as well as an enrichment of the mind. The book is very well produced and has many first class illustrations.

JOHN MAUCHLINE

MEDITATIONS FOR LENT

There are only sixty-four pages in *Consider Him*, by Dr. Olive Wyon (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net) but what pages they are! The book consists of three meditations on the Passion Story, and seldom can any book in so short a space have combined such radiant devotion, such real scholarly insight, and such practical help for life and living.

These meditations are intended for Lent. 'Lent,' writes Dr. Wyon, 'is an opportunity to examine the direction of our lives; to see whether the main course is straight to God, or whether we have, all unconsciously, wandered into "by-ways."' The aim of this book is to put the Cross into the centre of life again. Dr. Wyon tells of the custom which St. François de Sales observed in the country districts of Savoy. 'The good Bishop had often noticed a farm servant going across the farmyard to the well to draw water; he also noticed that before she lifted the brimming pail she put a piece of wood into it. One day he went out to the girl and asked her: "Why do you do that?" She looked surprised and answered, as if it were a matter of course: "Why, to keep the water from spilling . . . to keep it steady!" Writing to a friend later the Bishop told this story and added: "So when your heart is distressed and agitated, put the Cross into the centre of your heart, to keep it steady!"'

Dr. Wyon's first meditation is on Jesus in the Upper Room, which she describes as a 'pool of quietness' but 'like the zone of quiet in the midst of a hurricane.' The second meditation is on Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane. She quotes Mark Rutherford: 'When we come near death, or near something which may be worse, all exhortation, theory, promise, advice, dogma, fail. The one staff, which perhaps may not break under us, is the victory achieved in the like situation by One who has preceded us, and the most desperate private experience cannot go beyond the garden of Gethsemane.' The third meditation is on Jesus on the Cross. As Catherine of Siena said: 'Nails would not have held God-and-Man fastened to the Cross, had Love not held Him there.' The book ends with two very beautiful acts of worship.

This is one of those rare books which both help a man's own soul and enable him to help the souls of others.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

A Teacher's Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, by Richard Glover (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 15s. net), is not by any means a new book. On the inside cover we are told that the late H. R. Mackintosh once said of this book: 'You may on a rare occasion see in a secondhand bookshop a book published many years ago, *A Teacher's Commentary on St. Matthew* by Richard Glover. If ever you do see a volume, do not miss the occasion. It is a preacher's gold mine.'

In a certain sense this is a unique book. It is a book to which the conventional labels do not at all apply. It is neither liberal, nor conservative, nor fundamentalist, nor anything else. It is a book by a man who took Scripture simply as it stands and expounded it in the most remarkable way. There is in it a width of learning and of sympathy and a wealth of expository genius which are amazing. For it the critical problems do not exist. The sign of Jonah, the command to baptize, the declaration that some would not see death till the Son of Man returned in power, the meaning of the promise to Peter—all the passages on which the critical scholars spend so much time are simply, lovingly expounded as they stand. It is

in fact notable that only when the writer deals with critical problems, as for instance with the two genealogies of Jesus, is he quite unconvincing.

The material for the preacher and teacher here is endless. We can only dip almost at random. The three temptations of Jesus are identified as The Temptation of the Physical Life, The Temptation of Spiritual Presumption, and The Temptation to Policy. The characteristics of the child-like spirit (Mt 18^{3-5}) are identified as simplicity, freedom from self-consciousness, freedom from calculation, a belief in love and all things high, humility. 'Children have only to learn, not to unlearn; only to do, not to undo.'

The book itself is a large and beautifully printed volume of three hundred and thirty-eight pages. We are deeply concerned that this book should not be dismissed as simply another fundamentalist or biblicist or ultra-evangelical volume on one of the Gospels. It will run that risk. We are greatly indebted to the publishers for bringing before us a book of such a wise simplicity that it defies all labels, and a book with such a wealth of expository insight that any preacher will indeed find it a treasure-house, not, it is true, to do his thinking for him, but, what is far better, to set him thinking himself.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

We draw attention to an unusual book which has come to hand—*The Self-Taught Country Organist and Choirmaster*, by Mr. Marmaduke P. Conway (Canterbury Press; 8s. 6d. net). The author, formerly organist and master of the choristers of Ely Cathedral, has in view the many organists, would-be organists, and choir-trainers who are out of reach of good tuition and expensive books. He has endeavoured 'to put in writing just such advice as he would give to country pianists who found themselves called on to act as organists and who to all intents and purposes would have to be self-taught.' We find here much good advice clearly and concisely presented.

From India we have received a useful book published by the Central Youth Committee of the National Christian Council and distributed by the Christian Literature Society. The author is Dr. W. M. Ryburn, the price is 12 annas, and the title is *Christ and Society*. The book is in three parts. The first studies the Biblical basis for a revolutionary Christian programme; the second applies this to such topics as property, work, authority, human differences, and war; the third suggests practical action for the Indian Church and the individual Christian. Each chapter concludes with questions for discussion. We commend this book to groups of young people everywhere who, impelled by a social concern, are turning to Bible study. We know no better short book for the purpose.

We warmly commend *Worship and Preaching*, by the Rev. Thomas M. Morrow, M.A., Principal of the Wesley Deaconess College, Ilkley (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). It is intended for the use of candidates who are preparing themselves for the lay ministry of the Methodist Church; but we believe that men of other communions and men who are long past the beginning of their preaching ministry will find profit in these wise, practical, and challenging chapters.

Teachers need all the help that they can get in order to make the thought of Paul intelligible to young people. Two small but excellent books on Paul are before us.

According to St. Paul: A Study-Course on the New Testament Letters, by Dr. H. F. Mathews (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is concerned not so much with the life of Paul as with the thought and message of his letters. The significance of these letters is that 'they reflect the kind of life the early Christians lived, and—more important still—the problems they had to face in conduct and belief; and they show the way in which they applied the teaching of Jesus and their faith in Him to the actual situations of life.' In the hundred and ten pages of this book each letter is taken and examined and elucidated. To take but one example, Dr. Mathews finds six great topics in 1 Corinthians. (1) *Unity*, 1^{1}–3^{23}. (2) *Marriage*, $7^{1-17.29.33}$. (3) *The Other Man's Conscience*, 8^{1-13}, $10^{22.23}$. (4) *Behaviour in Church*, 10^{14-21}, 11^{2-34}. (5) *Spiritual Gifts*, 12^{1}–14^{33}. (6) *Resurrection*, 15^{1-58}. This kind of analysis is of the greatest help towards understanding.

The relevance of the Pauline letters is brought out by an excellent series of topics and questions for discussion after each section. For instance, after the exposition of Ro 12–15, the following task is suggested. 'Draw up some paragraphs to indicate what is the duty of the Christian man of this generation toward (*a*) his employers; (*b*) the State; (*c*) his neighbours; (*d*) the men he works with, and (*e*) those who do not agree with him.

Whether for private study or as an aid to teaching and preaching, this book will prove invaluable.

The Travels and Letters of St. Paul, by Canon C. J. Stranks, M.A., M.Litt. (Religious Education Press; 2s. net), is a much smaller book. It is the substance of a series of lectures given to day school teachers at a refresher course. This book

has one great value. Often study of Paul and his life is so slow and so detailed that the drama and the panorama of his life and journeyings, and the full picture of his thought never appear. This book, with its quick sweep and its almost breathless narrative, does serve a most useful purpose. It has, even in its modest compass, certain very interesting suggestions, for instance, the suggestions that John Mark may have accompanied Paul and Barnabas as a teacher, and that Luke may at some time have been Paul's catechist. For all its shortness—it comprises only forty pages—there is real scholarship and mastery of the material here. It would never claim to be complete, but it would be difficult to find a better introduction to the life and letters of Paul, or an introduction better calculated to make the student wish to go further.

For the preacher *At the House of the Interpreter*, by the Rev. Roderic Dunkerley (Independent Press ; 6s. net), will be a very useful book. Dr. Dunkerley writes : ' Some people collect old china, some postage stamps, and others all sorts of oddments. Like many other ministers and preachers I have for a long time " collected " what seemed to me interesting and unusual interpretations of scriptural texts. I would like now to share some of these with my brethren.' So in this short volume of a hundred and four pages Dr. Dunkerley gives us studies of twelve Old Testament and thirty-four New Testament texts.

Writing on Mt 23^{23}, where Jesus charged the Scribes and Pharisees with stressing trifles and neglecting the weightier matters of the Law, Dr. Dunkerley makes an interesting suggestion. Jesus charged the orthodox leaders with forgetting *judgment, mercy,* and *faith*. Dr. Dunkerley thinks that Jesus had in His mind Mic 6^{8}, where the prophet says of God : ' He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good ; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but *to do justly,* and *to love mercy,* and *to walk humbly with thy God* ? ' From this he draws the striking definition that Faith is walking humbly with God.

Dr. Dunkerley heads his interpretation of Ac 13^{1} : ' No colour bar at Antioch.' Barnabas was a Levite, and Saul was a Pharisee, and therefore they represented opposite tendencies in Jewish religion, the one being a representative of the Temple and its sacrifices, the other a representative of the Law and its commandments. Lucius has a Roman name, and may possibly have been a Roman, or at least a Roman citizen. Simeon is called *Niger* which means *black*, and may even have been a negro, perhaps from North Africa. Manaen was the foster brother of Herod Antipas, brought up in the luxury of the palace, and amidst the licence of the court. There were indeed no social or racial barriers among the prophets of Antioch.

This is a simple and unpretentious book, and will undoubtedly supply the busy preacher with ideas which will set him off on sermons of his own. It has the great virtue of giving a man enough to start him, but not enough to do it all for him.

Mr. Philip Mason, formerly of the Indian Civil Service and now Director of Studies on Race Relations at the Royal Institute of International Affairs, delivered the Burroughs Memorial Lectures in 1956, and they are now published as *Christianity and Race* (Lutterworth Press ; 10s. 6d. net).

The title of the book adequately describes the main topic, but the author approaches it by way of the challenge to the Christian ethic presented by the evolutionary ethic of Julian Huxley and by the attitude of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa. He also presents his own view of the Christian ethic with interesting references to New Testament passages and only then makes a practical application to the racial situation in the world to-day.

It would be a pity if the author's lively style should conceal the width of knowledge and practical experience which lie behind this book. It should be widely useful in dissolving some of the perplexities which beset the Christian mind in grappling with this vital subject.

In the life of a prolific writer of books there are usually two stages. There is the stage, at the beginning, when he writes the books that he feels he must write, and when he writes because the Spirit really and truly moves him ; and there is the time when he writes the books which his public and his publisher demand that he should continue to produce. In *The Three Meanings*, by Harry Emerson Fosdick (S.C.M. ; 16s. net), the S.C.M. Press has given us a reprint in the one volume of Dr. Fosdick's three books, *The Meaning of Prayer, The Meaning of Faith,* and *The Meaning of Service*. These were three of Dr. Fosdick's earliest books, and to many of us they are his three greatest books. In the preface to the new [1949] edition of *The Meaning of Prayer* he writes : ' One summer in an empty Maine cottage close by the sea, with a rough table and chair as the only furniture, I immured myself, day after day, as in a monastic cell, to write this book.' Those of us who have already read these books, which have sold literally by the hundred thousand, will welcome this omnibus edition, and we will envy with all our hearts those who will in this volume discover them for the first time. One thing is certain—in these days of expensive books, there has seldom appeared such a bargain as this.

Papyrus Bodmer II:

A Preliminary Report

By the Reverend C. K. Barrett, D.D., The University of Durham

The publication of Papyrus Bodmer II is an outstanding event in New Testament textual criticism. No equally substantial find has been made since that of the Chester Beatty Papyri, and the Bodmer Papyrus will provide material for discussion for many years to come. The present article makes no claim to be anything more than a preliminary reconnaissance of the terrain; it will be followed as soon as possible by a more thorough survey, and an attempt to define the place of the Papyrus in the tradition of the New Testament text.

Readers will wish to have first of all a brief description of the MS. and its contents. For all this we are indebted to Professor Victor Martin of Geneva, who has published the Papyrus[1] with the thoroughness and accuracy expected of one of the most distinguished living papyrologists, and with a promptness and speed which are an example to all who have important ancient documents in their care. Of the provenance of the MS. he tells us nothing; it belongs to the collection of the *Bibliothèque Bodmer* at Cologny (near Geneva), and therewith for the present we must be content. Presumably the Papyrus came, like almost all papyri, from Egypt.

The Contents of the MS. The MS. originally contained a copy of St John's Gospel, of which there remains 1^{1}–6^{11} 6^{35}–14^{26} (two leaves [four pages] are wanting, as well as the end of the MS.). The latest communication from the *Bibliothèque Bodmer* reports that a newly acquired lot of papyrus contains fragments belonging to the later chapters of the same MS. Since these are small it will take some time to piece them together, but there is reason to hope that in due course it will be possible to quote Papyrus Bodmer II for Jn 15–21 as well as for 1–14. That this MS. should contain the Fourth Gospel is particularly welcome because the Chester Beatty Papyrus (P^{45}) contains, in addition to fairly substantial portions of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts, only Jn $10^{7\text{-}25}$ 10^{31}–11^{10} $11^{18\text{-}36}$ $11^{42\text{-}57}$. Rylands Papyrus 457, perhaps the oldest New Testament MS. known, contains only Jn $18^{31\,\text{ff.}\,37\,\text{f.}}$.

In the official list of New Testament MSS. the Bodmer Papyrus will be P^{66} (and will in this article be so referred to; in addition the conventional sigla will be used).

The Form of the Manuscript. P^{66} is a codex. The importance of the fact that the codex came into use much earlier than was once supposed, and that papyrus as well as vellum was made into codices, has been recently much discussed.[2] P^{66} seems to have contained only a single book (John begins on p. 1),[3] and it cannot therefore be used to support the view that the papyrus codex superseded the roll because it was desired to have in one volume a collection of sacred books (such as the Four Gospels) too long to be written on one roll. It may reflect merely the changing habits of book-production.

The MS. is of almost square shape: 16.2 cm. high, by 14.2 cm. wide. There is only one column on a page; ample margins are left both at the sides, and above and below the writing. We have at present pages 1–34, 39–108; it is calculated that the complete Gospel must have occupied about a hundred and forty-six pages. Where it is impossible to print facsimiles it is scarcely worth while to attempt to describe the writing of the MS. Professor Martin gives three excellent plates, which show a hand executed with reasonable care (though as will appear below there are not a few examples of inattention), and still very easily legible.

The Date of the Manuscript. The question when the MS. was written, which all readers will wish to ask, is one on which only experienced palæographers have a right to an opinion. The present writer cannot claim this right, nor has he seen the MS.; but, so far as his knowledge goes, he can see in the facsimile plates given by Professor Martin nothing inconsistent with the view (in which a number of experts concur) that the Papyrus was written at about A.D. 200. This date is supported not only by the general appearance of the letters, but also by several other considerations. Thus contractions for *nomina sacra* appear, but ir-

[1] *Papyrus Bodmer II: Évangile de Jean, chap.* 1–14: Publié par Victor Martin; Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Cologny-Genève, 1956.

[2] See especially C. H. Roberts, 'The Codex,' in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, xl. [1954], 169–204.

[3] This however is not decisive; in some MSS. pagination begins afresh with each new book. See e.g. H. Thompson, *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles* [1932], 11.

egularly. The only words always contracted re θεός, Ἰησοῦς, κύριος, and Χριστός (Martin, 27); ἄνθρωπος, πατήρ, πνεῦμα, and υἱός are ometimes contracted. A similar irregularity is ound in punctuation (see below). The paragraphs into which the text is divided are not those of Ammonius. On all these points, reference hould be made to Professor Martin's introduction. Most students of the New Testament will be repared to proceed, until different arguments prevail, upon the view that in P66 we have a witness to the text of the Greek New Testament contemporary with Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria, and more than a hundred years older than Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus.

The Text of the Manuscript. The proper way to study a text is to collate it with some agreed standard text, tabulating its variations. These may then be compared with those of other MSS. and families of MSS., and analysed. In this way the place in the MS. tradition of the text in question may be considered, and its general importance assessed. All these processes must in due course be carried out for P66, and, as was said above, the present writer hopes to contribute to them. But they take time, and for this preliminary report a different method must be adopted. A number of well-known and important textual problems in Jn 1–14 have been collected, and we shall ask what light P66 throws on each in turn. This cannot be described as a systematic method of study, but it is not unscientific. Textual critics to-day practise 'eclectic criticism', and recognize that it is no longer possible to speak of 'good' MSS., whose readings are almost always right, and 'bad' MSS., whose readings are almost always wrong. 'Good' and 'bad' readings stand side by side in MSS. both early and late; we shall see that this is true of P66. We cannot say, 'P66 is the oldest substantial MS. of John; its readings are therefore probably to be adopted.' All we can say is that its readings were current at a very early date—perhaps within a century of the date when John was written. But even so, some of them may be erroneous.[1]

(*a*) 1[3. 4]. These two verses contain a well-known problem of punctuation (cf. (*i*) below.) Most printed texts read: . . . χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν. ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν . . . It would however be equally possible to place the full stop after ἓν, taking ὃ γέγονεν as the subject of ἦν. Both punctuations have received a good deal of support, and there is much to be said on both sides. What is the contribution of P66 to this disputed issue? Unfortunately our study must begin with a disappointment. The text of P66 runs: χωρὶς α[ὐτοῦ] ἐγένετο οὐδὲν ὃ γέγονεν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. It will be noted that (i) for οὐδὲ ἕν, P66 has οὐδέν (with ℵ* D pc)[2]; (ii) the ἐν before αὐτῷ has disappeared. Nothing need be said here about (i). Variant (ii) is easily accounted for as due to haplography; after writing the last syllable of γέγονεν the copyist proceeded immediately to αὐτῷ. This lapse (not by any means the only one in the MS.) makes it impossible to be certain how it was intended that the sentences should be read. There is however one pointer. Unlike some early MSS. (but like P45), P66 is provided, not very consistently it is true, with punctuation marks.[3] In the first few lines, for example, there are stops after ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος; . . . θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος; . . . δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; . . . ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει; . . . οὐ κατέλαβεν. There is no such stop after οὐδέν. It is a fair guess that a stop may have been dropped after γέγονεν along with the ἐν; but this is an unnecessary, as it is an unverifiable, hypothesis. We cannot say that, because no stop intervenes, the copyist *must* have intended ὃ γέγονεν to be taken with οὐδέν; but we can say that the Papyrus inclines slightly to that construction.

(*b*) 1[18]. In this verse, Westcott and Hort followed B ℵ pesh boh and a number of Fathers in reading μονογενὴς θεός, instead of μονογενὴς υἱός. They are supported by P66. This is indeed a strong combination; yet those who have hitherto been unconvinced by Hort's arguments will probably continue to be unconvinced, for Hort could already claim the support of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and the new MS. simply confirms that the reading was current in Alexandria (probably) *c.* A.D. 200—which could not in any case be disputed.

(*c*) 1[28]. The scene of John's baptizing is given in the MSS. in various forms: Bethany, Bethabara, Bethebara, Betharaba. Bethany is almost certainly correct. Origen, though on the basis of his geographical researches he favoured Bethabara, knew that Bethany stood in 'almost all the copies.' It stands in P66—and it is of course not impossible that P66 was one of the copies in which Origen had seen it.

(*d*) 4[49. 51]. In the first of these verses, the officer's son is in most MSS. described by the word παιδίον; but παῖς is used in ℵ it, υἱός in φ vg. P66 has παιδίον.

In *v.* 51 there is a double variation. For the

[1] I must here refer once for all to my Commentary on St John's Gospel for fuller information on many of the points raised in this article.

[2] Martin underlines this reading as '*une leçon nouvelle différente de celle ou celles de la tradition.*' Here and elsewhere it appears that this description is given with reference only to the good but incomplete apparatus of Souter.

[3] See further on (*i*).

substantive, the majority of MSS. have *παῖς*, but D 33 it vg cur pesh have *υἱός*. For pronoun, B ℵ and others have *αὐτοῦ* (which gives a clause in indirect speech), D *Θ* *ω* it cur pesh have *σου* (which gives a clause in direct speech). P^{66} has *ὁ υἱός σου*. This reading is best regarded as an assimilation to *v.* 50 (53); that is, P^{66}, old as it is, gives us a secondary and corrupt text.

(*e*) 5^{2}. There are two important textual problems in this verse. (i) It is probable that the original reading was: *ἐπὶ* (or *ἐν*) *τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβηθρα ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη, κτλ.* But is *κολυμβήθρα* (here left unaccented) nominative or dative? That is, should we translate, 'By the Sheep (-gate ?), a pool which is called . . .', or, 'By the Sheep-pool, the (place, or building) which is called . . .'? Professor J. Jeremias[1] has argued forcibly that the dative should be read, using, among other arguments, the fact that 'the whole ancient tradition takes *προβατικὴ κολυμβήθρα* together' (p. 6). What is the witness of P^{66} on this point? Unfortunately it is not clear. The Papyrus reads:

. . . επι τη προβατικη· κο
λυμβηθρα· η επιλεγομενη . . .

Thus the word *κολυμβηθρα* is enclosed between *two* raised points. If there were only one, the answer would be clear, one way or the other; but this is not so. Professor Martin asks, '*Serait-ce . . . pour avertir le lecteur que ce substantif doit être séparé de l'adjectif qui le précède et n'est pas au même cas en dépit de l'orthographe?*' (p. 24). This is a reasonable suggestion; the second point would be the real punctuation mark, the first a pointer to the construction. If this view is accepted, Professor Jeremias's argument breaks down. P^{66}, one of the most ancient witnesses, does not take *προβατικὴ* and *κολυμβήθρα* together. It must however be acknowledged that the punctuation of P^{66} is erratic. A few examples (for which I give page and line in P^{66} as well as chapter and verse in John) will make this clear.

9.3 (2^{10}): *σὺ τετήρηκας τὸν καλὸν· οἶνον ἕως ἄρτι*
26.3 (5^{3}): *πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενούντων· τυφλῶν χωλῶν· ξηρῶν*
49.6 (7^{34}): *ζη· τήσετέ με*
89.15 (12^{25}): *ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν· αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτήν*
100.5f. (13^{22}): *. . . παραδώσει με· ἔβλεπον· οὖν εἰς ἀλλήλους· οἱ μαθηταὶ· αὐτοῦ ἀπορούμενοι*
100.10 (13^{24}): *νεύ· ει· οὖν· τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος*

104.10f. (14^{6}): *ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθια [sic]· καὶ ἡ ζωή· οὐδεὶς . . .*

In view of these examples it seems impossible to conclude with certainty that the copyist of P^{66} intended to separate *κολυμβήθρα* from *προβατική*. Nevertheless, whether by accident or design, he has suggested this separation, and Professor Jeremias's argument[2] is to some extent weakened.

(ii) In the same verse, P^{66} supports B W vg, etc., in the name Bethsaida.

(*f*) 5^{44}. P^{66} joins B W a b sah boh Origen (sometimes) Eusebius in omitting *θεοῦ*, thus leaving *ὁ μόνος* as a title of God—a title unique in the Johannine writings. The combination now becomes very powerful and may well be right.

(*g*) 6^{69}. The reading of ℵ B D sah is probably original: *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*. This confession of faith is in different MSS. variously conformed to the synoptic confession of Peter (Mk 8^{29} and parallels). P^{66} has *ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*. Thus the Papyrus gives what is very probably a secondary reading.

(*h*) 7^{8}. The reading *οὐκ ἀναβαίνω* (ℵ D it vg sin cur boh) presents an evident difficulty of a superficial kind: Jesus *did* go up to the feast. Accordingly many MSS. (B W *Θ* pesh hcl sah) correct *οὐκ* to *οὔπω*. They are joined by P^{66}, whose reading must again be dismissed as secondary.

(*i*) $7^{37.38}$. These verses present another problem of punctuation. The alternatives are:

(i) *ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, κτλ.*

(ii) *ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με. καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ.*

Here there can be no question (cf. (*a*) above) how the copyist of P^{66} intended the words to be read. He places a raised point between *πινέτω* and *ὁ*, and thus unambiguously supports (i).

(*j*) 7^{52}. This verse raises serious difficulty. Jonah the son of Amittai came from Galilee (2 K 14^{25}), and the Rabbinic tradition took the view that all parts of the land of Israel had sent forth prophets. In view of this, Dr. Bultmann[3] suggested that instead of *προφήτης* (all MSS.) *ὁ προφήτης* (cf. 7^{40}) be read. This reading now appears in P^{66}. It is not thereby proved original, but the conjecture gains a good deal of weight.

(*k*) 8^{25}. The translation of *τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν* gives rise to much difficulty. It is

[1] In *Die Wiederentdeckung von Bethesda* (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, N.F. 41) [Göttingen, 1949].

[2] Which was accepted by the present writer—*ad loc.*

[3] *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (*Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, 11th Ed.) [Göttingen, 1950], 236.

worth noting that P^{66} writes the word ὅτι thus: ο τι (that is, presumably, ὅ, τι). Further, it prefixes to the sentence (in a marginal correction) the words εἶπον ὑμῖν, and in the next verse for ἔχω has ἔχων. The participle can hardly be constructed with ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με ἀληθής ἐστιν, and must therefore be constructed with the sentence that precedes it (unless, as is quite possible, it is no more than a slip). Thus P^{66} gives us the sentence: εἶπον ὑμῖν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ, τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, πολλὰ ἔχων περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν. This must presumably be translated: 'I told you in the beginning that which also I am speaking to you [now], since I have many things to speak and judge concerning you.' It seems doubtful whether this is an improvement on the current text, of which it is probably a secondary development.

(*l*) 10^{18}. Here the more difficult, and probably correct, reading is the aorist ἦρεν (P^{45} B ℵ*). P^{66} has αἴρει (ερι (*sic*)) with the rest.

(*m*) 11^{33}. Once more P^{66} follows what appears to be a secondary reading, though it is one which now has very strong external support. The old uncial text is: (Jesus) ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν. The two difficulties in this text (the application of the very strong word ἐμβριμᾶσθαι to Jesus, and the reflexive use of ταράσσειν) are both removed in the alternative: ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμβριμούμενος P^{45} D sah; (P^{66} has ἐμβριμώμενος). Notwithstanding the antiquity of this reading that of B ℵ may be preferred. One marvels at the skill and integrity of the Alexandrian editors in going behind such pleasing glosses.

(*n*) 13^{2}. P^{66} has the difficult reading in which Judas appears in the nominative case. The genitive is a secondary simplification.

(*o*) 13^{10}. This verse presents a well-known and important textual problem. It exists in three forms. In the first (i) Jesus says, ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι. In the second (ii) εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας is omitted. There is a third form of the verse (iii), ὁ λελουμένος οὐ χρείαν ἔχει τὴν κεφαλὴν νίψασθαι εἰ μὴ τόυς πόδας μόνον. (i) is read by B W and most of the Latin versions. (ii) by ℵ c and some Vulgate codices—perhaps the original text of Jerome; (iii) by D (Θ). P^{66} does not agree precisely with any of these, but runs: ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας μόνον νίψασθαι. The μόνον in both D and P^{66} is probably due to the influence of *v.* 9 (μὴ τοὺς πόδας μου μόνον). D (with its reference to the head) represents a further development in this direction. The tradition as a whole is best explained if (ii) is taken to be the original text; expanded by the addition of εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας; expanded further by the addition of μόνον (P^{66}), under the influence of *v.* 9; expanded yet again by the addition of κεφαλή. If this is a correct account of what took place, P^{66} stands (at this point) some distance from the source of the tradition.

(*p*) 14^{4}. The well-known form of this verse rests upon the text of D Θ ω it vg sin pesh sah: ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδατε. The more difficult, and probably correct, reading of B ℵ W is ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν. The copyist of P^{66} first wrote the long text, then corrected it to the short form by erasing καί and the second οἴδατε.

(*q*) 14^{7}. The conditional sentence in this verse exists in two forms, a reproof and a promise: (i) εἰ ἐγνώκειτέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἂν ᾔδειτε (ἐγνώκειτε, Θ ω) (B Θ ω); (ii) εἰ ἐγνώκατέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου γνώσεσθε (ℵ D). Both readings are ancient; good reasons can be found for preferring (ii); and this proves to be the reading of P^{66}.

(*r*) 14^{14}. In this verse the alternatives τοῦτο ποιήσω (B φ it vg), and ἐγὼ ποιήσω (ℵ D W Θ) are nicely balanced. The copyist of P^{66} first wrote ἐγὼ ποιήσω, then added τοῦτο in the margin. This observation is important, because it enables us to see the process of conflation actually going on at the very early date at which P^{66} was written.

Conclusion. It must be emphasized that these notes present only a few sample readings of the new Papyrus. To use them as a basis for generalizations would be quite wrong. It is not, however, improper to note what we have in fact found. We have found one passage where P^{66} offers a new reading with some claim to be regarded as original (*j*), but two others (*k*, *r*) where new readings are probably to be rejected. We have found passages where P^{66} adds its weight to what already appeared to be the best text (*c*, *n*, *p*, *q*), others where P^{66} stands on what we may regard as the 'wrong' side (*b*, *d*, *g*, *h*, *l*, *m*, *o*), and others again where its authority may well sway our judgement (*e*, *f*, perhaps *b*). Notwithstanding its great age, and its many excellent readings, it contains errors, and shows undoubted signs that the writer was by no means always taking in the sense of what he wrote. For example, at 95. 14 (Jn 13^{1}), for πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, he writes προ $\overline{\nu\ \pi\rho\alpha}$ (correction is made between the lines). Many such mistakes could be quoted. P^{66} is a most important and valuable document, but it must not be idolized simply because it is old. It illustrates admirably the truth of Streeter's remark about the first and second centuries: 'It was during this period that all the really important various readings arose.'[1]

[1] B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*[5] [1936], 36.

Old Testament Exegesis, Imaginative and Unimaginative

A Reply to Professor McCullough's article, 'Israel's Kings, Sacral and Otherwise'

By Professor Aubrey R. Johnson, Ph.D., D.D., F.B.A., University College, Cardiff

I am obliged to the Editors of The Expository Times for their kindness in so promptly giving me the opportunity of replying to Professor McCullough's criticism of my recent monograph, and I do so under the headings which he himself has adopted.

1. *The Monarchy.* It is, of course, true that in my monograph I am 'thinking mostly of the Davidic line in Jerusalem,' and this explains my careful choice of a title, *i.e.*, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel.* The evidence for the ideas of kingship in the north is comparatively slight, but even so the reader will find nothing in my monograph to suggest that the kingly standard to which Professor McCullough refers 'was the sole possession of the rulers of Judah.' I am quite prepared to believe that 'it may have been cherished in Northern Israel as well,' if the proof is forthcoming; but it seems to me desirable to keep to the evidence rather than resort to unsubstantiated conjecture of the type here advanced by Professor McCullough.

Moreover these paragraphs in which Professor McCullough comments on the 'idealized royalty' of my book as compared with 'the kings of Jerusalem and Samaria as we meet them in the Old Testament records' are curiously beside the point. When he asks himself, 'What has all this to do with the general picture of Israel's kings which we get from the Old Testament?' he should be able to find the answer by asking himself further questions of the following type. What has the elaborate legislation for the rôle of the high-priest on the Day of Atonement to do with the general picture which we get of the Hasmonaean High-Priesthood? Or again, what have the New Testament and the festivals of the Christian Church to do with the general picture which we get of the mediæval Papacy during, say, the latter part of the fifteenth century A.D.? The conclusion of the matter is simple. Professor McCullough's indictment of the rulers in Samaria and Jerusalem has no bearing on my argument or its conclusions.

2. *The King as Religious Leader.* Professor McCullough's comment on the fact that the Law contains no echoes of such a cultic rôle of the king as I describe suffers from (*a*) a failure to make sufficient allowance for the fact that the Law, as we have it, is a deposit of the post-exilic period when the Davidic king was no more and the high-priest alone was the leading cultic figure, and (*b*) the mistake, all too common in current Old Testament study, of continuing to think in terms of a unilinear development when seeking to trace the history of Israel's religious thought and practice.[1] For the rest, these paragraphs on the prerogatives and influence of the priesthood (with their argument in terms of 'possibly' this and 'possibly' that) in no way militate against my thesis concerning the rôle of the king as a sacral person, and I quite fail to see their relevance to the question at issue.

3. *The House of David.* Professor McCullough's argument in these two paragraphs with regard to what he calls the 'Davidic House dogma' introduces a value judgment which, again, has no bearing whatsoever on the validity of my own argument.

4. *Israel's Autumnal Festival.* Professor McCullough's opening paragraph ignores the important point that, if there is little *direct* evidence for the ritual and mythology of the festival in question, there is some valuable *indirect* evidence available which, once we follow its lead, goes far to solve the perplexing problem as to why so important a festival *apparently* left so little trace. Accordingly the way in which Professor McCullough refers to my 'imaginative reconstruction of the cultic procedure' does less than justice to the way in which I have built up my argument step by step. What is more, I am happy to think that one reviewer was prompt to recognize that my theory throws light 'on many obscure details in the Psalter which have fitted into no pattern.'[2] This is surely important; and, as I am here involved in the task of conducting my own defence, perhaps I may be allowed to add that it does so without recourse to that ready emendation of the Hebrew text which has done so much to bedevil Old Testament studies.

As regards the possible influence of the Jebusite cultus, it is for Professor McCullough to meet the arguments advanced and not to dismiss what I have to say on this point as an assertion which 'it is of course impossible either to prove or to disprove.' Moreover, to the authorities which I have cited in

[1] Cf. my remarks in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley [1951], 192 f.

[2] *The Times Literary Supplement*, February 17th 1956.

my monograph I may now add the very careful study by H. Schmid, 'Jahwe und die Kult-traditionen von Jerusalem,'[1] which was written quite independently of my own work and indeed was completed while the latter was still in the Press.

(*a*) In his comments on Ps 48 Professor McCullough ignores two important points with regard to the *Pi'ēl* of √ דמה. In the first place the Old Testament passages which he cites are all listed by me in an earlier monograph to which I carefully draw the reader's attention[2]; but, as I pointed out, wherever in the Old Testament this form of the verb is supposed to have the meaning 'to think,' it invariably has a future reference, so that it is altogether unlikely that the reference in Ps 48[9f.] (EVV 8 f.) was to 'Yahweh's *past*[3] exertions on behalf of Israel'; and this is confirmed by the fact, ignored by Professor McCullough, that there is no known historical situation which corresponds to the preceding colourful reference to the overthrow of a group of foreign kings within the holy city itself. What is more, Professor McCullough also ignores the remarkable use of the *Pi'ēl* of √ דמה in Hos 12[11] (EVV 10), which, as I also pointed out in the forementioned work, seems best explained in terms of the creative symbolism of the prophets.[4]

(*b*) As regards Ps 89, Professor McCullough is here mainly concerned with questionable value judgments which again have no bearing on the validity of my argument. For the rest, it is to be observed that the language of the psalm lacks the concreteness and clarity of reference which is to be found in those poems which unmistakably reflect a definite historical situation, such as the song of Deborah (Jg 5), David's lament over Saul and Jonathan (2 S 1[17ff.]), and Ps 74, 79, and 137. That is to say, it is much more in keeping with a piece of ritual which is not restricted to a single temporal situation.

(*c*) To say that I make the text of Ps 110[3] the principal basis of my theory is a complete exaggeration. As a matter of fact my treatment of the expression חילך (which is by no means necessary for the establishment of my case) did not occur to me until I had completed the argument of the preceding pages; and it was only in the light of my earlier findings that I realized how straightforward the consonantal text of the whole of this verse really is.[5] As for the verbal form in question, I see no reason why the suffix should not be construed as objective, for I find it difficult to believe that a verb which is used of child-birth can have 'no reference to the offspring'! In short, it is not a case of making a 'notoriously difficult' text the principal basis of my theory but one of using a theory which has been built up quite independently to interpret a difficult passage without recourse to that ready emendation of the Hebrew text which I have already deplored.

(*d*) Professor McCullough's concluding remarks about Yahweh's conflict with 'death' (which are evidently intended to be as devastating as his reference to the moral and political behaviour of some of the kings in Jerusalem and Samaria!) are indeed such as to reduce me to despair—but for a very different reason from that which, no doubt, Professor McCullough had in mind. In the preface to my monograph I refer carefully to the fact that I have spent much of my time during the last twenty years trying to examine the Israelite forms of thought relating to both God and man so as to do justice *inter alia* to this question of the cultic rôle of the king in ancient Israel; and I refer in this connexion to an earlier monograph in which I discuss at length the Israelite ideas of חיים *qua* 'life' and מות *qua* 'death.'[6] Yet, for all the notice which Professor McCullough has taken of this work, it need never have been written; so I content myself with saying that the whole of this concluding section with its reference to 'meaningless mumbo jumbo' is again completely irrelevant and has no bearing whatsoever on my argument.

To sum up, while Professor McCullough apparently deplores the use of the imagination in one's approach to the words of Scripture, it seems to me that it is the lack of a disciplined imagination and the accompanying failure to recognize in classical Hebrew, not a dead language to be pinned down by the system-loving grammarian, but the living language of a people whose forms of thought and modes of expression were markedly different from our own, which has led to so much unnecessary emendation of the text and has blinded us to so much that is of fundamental importance in the Old Testament records. I must conclude, therefore, with an expression of gratitude to Professor McCullough for so clearly underlining this point and confirming me in the soundness of my methods.

---

[1] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, lxvii. [1955], 168–197.

[2] *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* [1944], 39, n.1.

[3] Italics mine.

[4] *Op. cit.*, 38 ff.

[5] The reader should compare (*a*) my earlier acceptance of the view that it is difficult to find any sense in Ps 110[3], *i.e.*, in my essay 'The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus,' in *The Labyrinth*, ed. S. H. Hooke [1935], 110; and (*b*) the fact that it was only after the elaboration of my theory that I found it unnecessary to accept the usual emendation of Ps 48[15] (EVV 14) to which Professor McCullough still clings in the concluding section of his article.

[6] *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* [1949].

Preaching on the Positives

A Study on Sermon Construction

By the Reverend James N. Alexander, M.A., Glasgow

An American Professor of theology sat in his study discussing a theological problem with a friend. His little daughter, a child of seven playing beside them, was caught by the frequently reiterated remark, 'I'm afraid he's wrong.' 'No! that won't do.' At length she turned to them impatiently. 'What is it?' she asked, 'if it ain't?'

There are erudite and able books which evoke the same question in the truth-seeking reader. An acute and painstaking analysis of each angle of approach is presented, with a critical assessment of one theological position after another, and many acute comments on defects in this or that theory, but in the end, where are we?

> Myself when young did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and Saint, and heard great argument
> About it and about: but evermore
> Came out by the same door as in I went.

Has not the writer himself positive convictions on one side or the other? If he has, why doesn't he say so plainly?

As men engaged in the pastoral ministry who have neither time nor capacity to become professional theologians we plead for more in the way of helpful and positive directives. We are grateful for the scholarship which can probe and sift the chaff from the wheat, but point us as plainly and honestly and convincingly as you can to 'what it is, if it ain't.'

This plea has an added cogency as applied to preaching and sermon construction. I have no wish or intention to enter the general field of homiletics and deal with the broad question of sermon construction. My aim is much less ambitious—to pass on the conviction, which has grown in me through a life-time of sermonizing, that the flaw and weakness and general ineffectiveness of many a carefully prepared sermon lies in its too negative quality and emphasis. The right things are there, but not in their proper proportion. An early experience will serve as an illustration. While I was a student in my last year in Divinity, a friend, newly settled in his first charge, came to me on the Saturday afternoon with his sermon for Sunday. He was not happy about it. We read it together. It was on the text 'And he went a little farther.' It was a thoughtful and moving sermon. It dwelt on the fact that there is a limit to what the human companionship of the chosen three could do to help their Master in the dread ordeal which faced Him. He had to leave them behind and 'tread the wine-press alone.' The sermon went on to speak of the lonely places in life, culminating in a description of the utter aloneness of Christ's zero-hour on Calvary. As he laid his manuscript aside, my friend exclaimed: 'I feel there is something lacking. But what is it?' Being more or less a novice in the art of preaching, I could suggest nothing. Next day in church, as the sermon was preached, illumination came to both of us. The sermon had no 'lift' in it. One sorrowful experience succeeded another, with *far too little elaboration of the other side of the picture*—namely, the Divine resources which matched the utter solitariness of the Saviour's own soul on Calvary and what that might mean to men in extremity, with no help for them in man. 'Yet I am not alone,' said our Lord, 'because the Father is with me.'

A diet of negatives leaves people unsatisfied, exasperated, depressed. *Let the positives have priority.*

Negative preaching is a pitfall which entraps the unwary. Especially for the young preacher, hot and clamouring to express his views on 'what is wrong with the world,' it is a temptation hard to resist. Texts are not easy to find nor sermons to write but here, ready to hand, in the world's disorder, is a talking point about which there is plenty to say! Let him beware! Unless he plans carefully from the outset and fixes the pattern of his sermon, by the time he has exposed fallacies, analyzed and dissected the why and wherefore of things gone wrong, he is almost certain to find himself with barely five minutes left in which to tell his people what God has to say. And so the preacher has lost the opportunity of saying with any adequate power and meaning the one thing he is in the pulpit to say.

What will help? (*a*) Before setting out to write a sermon on a particular text the wise writer will make it clear to himself what core of Bible truth he finds here and wishes to make explicit. Consciously or unconsciously this will dominate his mind, determine his approach and help considerably to put his message in its true Biblical perspective.

(*b*) Much can be learned here from the great masters in the art of sermon construction. So keenly alive was F. W. Robertson to the danger of negative preaching that, according to one of his biographers, he would frequently select two texts rather than *one*, to bring out the complementary sides of some great Bible truth—the positive and the negative. 'At times Robertson dipped his brush into the darkest colours on his palette and he seldom painted a scene without shadows, but always in the forefront is the sky-line of God's eternal truth and love.'

If, therefore, a text with negative application is chosen, it may be well to follow F. W. Robertson and combine with it a text touching on the same theme but pointing to something constructive—for the good of both the hearers and the preacher.

This concern for the positives is as marked in another acknowledged master in the art of preaching—A. J. Gossip. Note the following sermon titles selected at random: 'The Terror and Hope of the Times,' 'Experience worketh Hope,' 'Some Blessed Certainties in an unstable World,' 'The Judgment and Mercy of God.' In every case, the balance (which is, significantly, the *Biblical* balance) is finely kept. The preacher is profoundly and even painfully aware of the human situation and, in dealing with the wrongness, inadequacy and sin of men's ways, summons all his powers of ridicule, pathos, and withering, prophetic anger. But long before the end is reached, Gossip goes all out to elaborate and exult in the God-given answer to it all.

(*c*) But 'preaching on the positives' lies deeper than any balancing device or technique. We must examine our calling as preachers of the Word; we need to assess (and re-assess many times throughout our ministry) the *office of the preacher* and the *content* of what we are called and ordained to preach.

We find that two simple vital propositions sum up 'the place wherein we stand.' (1) Preaching is pre-eminently proclamation; (2) The Evangel is a proclamation of positives. These two basic facts are the structure on which sermons should be designed and built.

(1) *Preaching is proclamation.* The preacher is a messenger. He is the herald of God, the ambassador of Christ, proclaiming what God in His final and unique revelation of Himself has made known to men in Christ. The preacher's function is not primarily to argue but to announce, not to reason but to tell. The art of persuasion may well be needed to bring men to the point when they are prepared to listen. But the objective in every case is to confront our hearers with the objective historical acts of God's redemptive activity culminating in Jesus Christ, the Word Incarnate. *A text of the Bible, therefore, is only of value as it helps us to achieve this end.* However we treat it, sooner or later, it must be linked with some real dogma of the faith. In the selection of a text, and in writing a sermon, our primary thought must be: How can I use these words of Scripture as a vehicle for proclamation, for the transmission of the Eternal Word, the Everlasting Christ, in some truth which lies close to the living core of the evangel? Such an approach will certainly save a man from 'pirouetting,' as Gossip puts it, 'with some petty bit of a text on the outskirts of things.' No one will commend a restricted diet of sermons on purely doctrinal texts. Said Denney's wife (with more than a hint to her husband), 'A man never knows how dull he can be until he tries to lecture right through one of Paul's Epistles!' Variety and colour in choice of texts are welcome. But, whatever the text, it must serve in some way to point men to Christ and proclaim 'what great things God hath done.' We are men under authority. 'The pulpit,' said P. T. Forsyth, 'is not a roomy place for a man to indulge his theorizings and develop his idiosyncracies. The pulpit is a witness-box.'

(2) *The Evangel is proclamation of positives.* In the ethical teaching of Jesus 'thou shalt' takes precedence over 'thou shalt not.' He is primarily concerned not with what men don't do but with what they must do. He calls on men 'to repent' but far oftener and far more insistently He calls on them 'to believe.' In His teaching on human destiny our Lord gives no clue to the problem of pain and suffering. He has little to reveal of the 'hereafter.' But, speaking with the first-hand knowledge and authority of 'One who came from God and goes to God,' He rings out the good news of great shining certitudes—the Fatherhood of God, God's mercy and forgiveness, the sure hope of life everlasting. Whatever things we don't know, and in this universe of baffling mysteries their name is legion, there are things we do know, now that God Himself has spoken in the 'Word made flesh.' The whole of the New Testament echoes with this same triumphant assurance. The preachers of the Early Church concentrate with passionate unanimity on the great positive ultimates. 'We *know* whom we have believed,' 'We *know* that all things work together for good to them that love God,' 'We know that if our earthly house be destroyed we have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,' 'We are *persuaded*, that neither death, nor life, nor things present, nor things to come, nor any other creature, can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

This then is our mandate as preachers of the Word—to point men to the beacon light of the great affirmatives of the gospel of God in Christ Jesus.

To see the practical bearing of all this on sermon construction, true New Testament preaching, adequately balanced preaching will not and cannot ignore the 'negatives.' The preacher must speak to his hearers' condition, meet them on their own level, make plain to them that he is keenly aware of their fears, perplexities, frustration, helplessness. But the Christian certitudes must never be far away and in the end they must ring like a bell. To take a simple example, a business man reading his morning paper full of disquieting news was heard to remark 'When I go to church on Sunday I hope my minister will tell me whose world this is—God's or the devil's.' Surely the answer to this is not to spend too much time dwelling on the devil's work in the world, but to switch expeditiously to the theme that is crying out to be dealt with—the deeply embedded Bible faith in the sovereignty of God and how it is that the Church in its creed can triumphantly proclaim 'I believe in God the Father Almighty,' and the Church of the New Testament persecuted and scattered by its enemies can nevertheless say with sublime assurance 'And He shall reign until He hath put all enemies under His feet.'

Such preaching is not easy. It demands study, careful and constant re-thinking of the central facts of the evangel as relevant to the present and ever-changing situation. But it cannot fail to be fruitful. In a book on public speaking the writer, addressing the pulpit from the pew, claims to speak not only for himself but for many others. 'We come to hear you speak of the Truth that is Eternal as it concerns us to-day. We live in a world where so few people believe anything at all. Tell us what *you* believe. We want you to expound the Bible, not just a text of it taken from its context. Give us God. Tell us about Him. We are constantly asking ourselves: What am I? What must I do? Whither am I going? Tell us plainly. If you have any sure word to keep men on their feet, let us hear it.'

Preaching on the positives! Such preaching is not only deeply satisfying, it uplifts, exhilarates, kindles into life and becomes charged with the Spirit of God. The 'Good News' becomes *new* good news, fresh and alive and powerful as ever to lift men 'out of the miry clay and the fearful pit, setting their feet upon a rock, putting a new song in their mouths.'

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Easter

By the Reverend Douglas Stewart, M.A., London

'And Peter answered him and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water. And he said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus.'—Mt 14^{28-29}.

'That's impossible!' we say at once, 'No one can walk on water.' It's difficult enough when we're learning to swim or to float on our backs to keep our heads out of the water, let alone the whole of us. Besides it breaks all the laws of Nature.

Now, so long as we think about Peter, and Peter alone, we're quite right. Peter certainly couldn't walk on the sea any more than you or I can. So let's forget Peter for a moment and concentrate instead on Jesus. After all it was Jesus who walked on the water first and commanded Peter to come to Him. Can you believe that Jesus could walk on the water?

Suppose Jesus had sunk into the sea, He would have been drowned, wouldn't He? That means He would have died, and what then? Now Jesus didn't drown, but He did die and what happened then? Death is rather like a great sea into which everyone sinks and disappears and Jesus also disappeared into it on Good Friday. But on Easter Day—to-day—He reappeared, walking on that sea of death. He was not swallowed up by it. He didn't disappear as all other dead people have done. His disciples met Him again risen from the dead.

This is the most astonishing thing which has ever happened in the whole of human history. How could anyone—even Jesus—walk on the sea of death and not be swallowed up? Can we understand it at all?

I remember once standing on a wild rocky part of the coast in early summer. A gale was blowing and great waves were pounding the rocks. No one—not even our Olympic champions—could have survived who tried to swim in that sea. And yet I was watching a sea bird which had just taken its chicks for a little sail. They were tiny little balls of fluff, smaller than day-old chicks. And as each great wave came rolling in it seemed that they must be destroyed. But they and their mother were quite unconcerned. Like little

orks they bobbed about on the top of the great waves pecking at odd bits of seaweed floating on the surf. God created these little creatures to be masters of the sea and for them it was not in the least dangerous. They were made to float on its stormy breast.

And to understand the Resurrection we must first understand the nature of Jesus. He was, in himself, master of the sea of death. 'I am the life,' He told His disciples. 'I am the resurrection and the life,' He told Mary and Martha. Because that was His nature, death could not destroy Him any more than the waves could destroy those little birds. At Easter we see Jesus walking above the waves of death.

But can we be sure this happened? I think that's where the story of Peter trying to walk on the Sea of Galilee comes in. Peter wanted to be sure. He wanted to try for himself. 'Call me,' he said to Jesus, 'Let me try for myself.' We can only be sure about the power of Jesus over both life and death when we have the courage to try it out in our own lives.

What courage Peter had to step off the ship on to the sea! How the others must have watched in terror! And yet in your life there will come a moment when you, too, will feel yourself commanded to leave what is safe and secure and step out in faith.

For a few steps Peter actually did it! He walked on the sea. He repeated the victory of Christ. Then he failed. He grew frightened. He began to sink. And that is exactly what happened, you remember, when Jesus was arrested. Peter followed when the other disciples forsook Him. He got as far as the Judgment Hall. Then he was frightened and denied Christ. But when Peter failed—both times—Jesus didn't fail him. He saved him from the sea and He saved him later from despair.

We are not ourselves masters either of life or of death. But Christ is master of both. Look to Him. He is our Saviour at all times.

Packet of Crisps, Please

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Ye are the salt of the earth.'—Mt 5^{13}.

Five million times a week in shops of Great Britain people say, 'Packet of crisps, please!' And five million crinkly bags of corrugated potato slices pass across the counters. That's a lot of crisps!

Frank Smith, who invented the potato crisp, died a few weeks ago, aged eighty-three. He started life as one of fourteen children of a small grocer, and often fetched sacks of potatoes from Covent Garden. He was sure people ought to like his frizzled bits of carbo-hydrate, but for long he sold only a few thousand packets a week.

Then he had an idea. Potatoes without salt are tasteless. So he screwed up a pinch of salt in blue paper, and tucked it into each packet; and soon the packets were selling like one o'clock. Sales romped up. New factories were built. He even bought up huge farms in Lincolnshire to grow the potatoes he needed. It's surprising what a little salt will do. Which is the point of our text.

Two or three centuries ago explorers and merchants opened up many new lands and brought fresh luxuries to us—tea, sugar, coffee, tobacco. But the men who really made those countries were those who took love and kindliness in the name of their Master. They opened hospitals, they built schools, they trained teachers, they taught backward peoples how to get the best out of the land God had lent them. These valiant missionary men and women were—and still are—the salt of the earth.

There have been schools of a sort in this country for a few ever since Alcuin founded his school at York. But about a hundred and forty years ago small groups of Christians began to say, 'It is time that children of all classes had the chance to read and write.' So they collected money and worked to open schools. Sometimes they spent their Sundays from 9 till 5 teaching. Sometimes they paid for a teacher to work during the week, and soon the State was following their lead. But without those first enthusiasts for National Schools and British Schools there would not have been much education in this land. They were the salt of the earth.

Only sixty years ago many old people who had worked hard all their lives but had been unable to save very much had to finish their days in grim stone buildings called 'Workhouses.' But a meeting of Christian men in Walworth, London, refused to let one of their number go 'into the big house.' They went up and down the country, roused public opinion in city and village, and eventually a Bill was presented to Parliament to make it possible for every old person to receive a little pension. When the Bill reached its third reading in the House of Commons those men of Walworth were praying that God would make it law—and He did. They were the salt of the earth.

But the text is in the second person, not the third—and you expert grammarians know the difference, I am sure. '*Ye* are the salt of the earth,' Jesus said. Are *you*?

The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT

I Know Not the Man

BY THE REVEREND HAROLD G. NEWSHAM, M.A.,
HARTFORD, CONN., U.S.A.,

'And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.'—Mk 14^{72}.

There are pages in Mark's Gospel which have the tang and tongue of Peter behind them. One of these, so vivid, so poignant, so unforgettable, is the story of Peter's denial. He told it, hiding nothing, over and over again. Told it to warn how his over self-confidence and imagined self-sufficiency had led to a terrible downfall. Told it to warn how fear disclosed a weakness in his moral fibre he had never dreamed was there.

But he told it for something far more worth the telling than that. He told it to reveal the unfathomable deeps in the love of Christ. He told it because after so devastating a collapse he had been forgiven; had been commissioned to service in the Kingdom of his Lord; had made the tremendous discovery that once he had ceased to trust in his own capacities and strength, once he had thrown himself upon the promise of an infinitely greater than himself to empower him, all the sand in him, the unstable, shifting undependable sand had become rock.

1. The fact that it may be from Peter himself we have the story explains why we really need to do some reading between the lines to get this denial into true perspective. Discerning readers realize that Peter, even in this lamentable affair, was a thousand times more courageous and loyal than we might have been. For instance, when they came to arrest Jesus in the Garden, it was Peter who drew his sword and began to make a fight for it. He was ready to take on the whole bunch of them alone, and he only desisted at the command of the Master. Now Peter himself evidently piped down on this part of the story, for we owe most of the details to one of the other biographers, rather than to Mark, who doesn't even name Peter as the hero, however misguided, of this last stand. It has, however, quite a significant bearing upon what Peter himself did disclose to Mark.

You will remember that when they arrested Jesus the disciples fled for their lives into the night, Peter among them. But Peter turned back, determined to be as near his Lord as is humanly possible to the end. More than that. They had taken Jesus to the palace of the High Priest, whose servant had evidently been among those entrusted with the arrest. One of them had felt the edge of Peter's sword. To go into the courtyard there and run the risk of being spotted was, as William Barclay, the Scottish New Testament scholar puts it, 'sheer audacity.'

And when he is recognized, who shall say that he wasn't justified under all the circumstances in trying to bluff it out? 'I don't know what you are talking about,' he retorts. The striking thing is that he doesn't take this as a warning, and quietly get out. No—he stays. Surely an act of courage of a high order. Then, after some time, it happens again.

But he is nearer to breaking point than he knows. Accused a third time, it isn't equivocation now; it isn't evasiveness now; it's a blistering denial that he had ever known the Man. Then, at that moment, Peter sees his Lord looking at him, not accusingly, but only sorrowfully and yearningly.

2. There is general agreement, I think, that there are few more bitter, more cruel and devastating experiences than to be disowned by some one with whom you have had close association.

How deep was the suffering in the heart of Jesus it is idle to speculate. What is certain is that even here Love was paramount. It was for the wrong Peter was doing his own soul that Jesus suffered and sorrowed.

There could have been only one more dreadful thing that night. Had Jesus looked at Peter, looked through him, as though He didn't know him; as though Peter were a stranger to Him, had never broken bread with Him or campaigned with Him. Had Jesus looked as though He had never known, and never would know, this fisherman—that would have been the crown of tragedy that night.

But, says the Fourth Gospel, 'having loved his own . . he loved them unto the end.' So Peter's denial 'I know not the Man' was met only by a look which cried aloud, 'But I know you, Peter. I know you are yet going to be My friend, faithful, after this, even unto death.'

> O Love of God, how strong and true!
> Eternal and yet ever new;
> Uncomprehended and unbought,
> Beyond all knowledge and all thought.

3. Yet, we must ever remember this is the Love of One who really does know the secrets of all our hearts; who knew that Peter's loyalty had been genuine; knew that he had come at last—as men have done in Red prison camps—to the breaking point. To deny Jesus under such circumstances as Peter did is one thing. But to deny Jesus, without any such deep love and commitment and going to

e very brink of the crater, is surely another. We ust set alongside this story of Peter's denial and glorious sequel, those other words of Jesus rning the casual, the complacent, the insincere, e hypocrite, the lip-worshipper, whose heart and ll are far distant, that there may come an hour indescribable sadness and solemnity when He ll have to say 'Though you called Me Lord, Lord, ever knew you.'

Peter's denial, under all the terrible pressures d after all the gallantry, was but a momentary ng. But there can be a denial which isn't mentary. A denial which goes on month after nth, year after year, which can be saying that really do not know Him to whom we are pro- ssing loyalty and friendship. It is a denial which n take many forms. It is being uttered when e do not put first seriously in our own plans and nsiderations the Kingdom of God and His ghteousness. It is being uttered when we are ndifferent about impoverishment and injustice; hen we make our Christianity a prescription for ur own selfish peace of mind and the solace of ur own little souls instead of a bugle call, to go rth to war with the Strong Son of God against he manifest wrongs and evils which abound.

And there are other forms of the denial 'I know ot the Man.' Are we not in effect saying precisely hat, if days and weeks go by and it never even nters our minds in the press of affairs, in the roblems and perplexities and confusions of life, o ask Him 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' or if we do not know that with Him there are esources greater far than our own unaided wills an conjure up, we do not know the Man.

From such a tragic denial, so much more serious han Peter's in the courtyard of the High Priest, may our worship assist us to be delivered.

PASSION SUNDAY

The Challenge of the Cross [1]

'Are ye able to drink the cup that I am about to drink.'—Mt 20^{22} (R.V.).

Did these sons of Zebedee realize the implications of the obligation they had so lightly accepted? Were they prepared to accept the grim challenge of the Cross?

What kind of people should we be and what manner of life should we practise, if we follow the way of the holy and venerable Cross?

First of all it commits us to the *exercise of a spirit of undiscourageable good-will.* When Jesus came to earth, the angels heralded His birth as the dawn of a new era of 'good-will to men.' By explicit exhortation and in parable after parable He taught that doctrine. On the Cross He practised what He preached, and refused all the overtures of His enemies to retaliate in kind. With His dying breath He breathed a prayer to God for the forgiveness of His murderers.

> Thy foes might hate, despise, revile,
> Thy friends unfaithful prove;
> Unwearied in forgiveness still,
> Thy heart could only love.

Here we have a new code of behaviour, a new reaction to sin. Magnanimity was not unknown in pagan circles. There were isolated instances here and there, but they were quite exceptional, and generally created surprise. The normal code, practised and commended everywhere, was what Xenophon wrote about Cyrus the younger, 'No one did more good to his friends, or more mischief to his enemies.' Judaism mercifully limited the law of revenge to retaliation in kind. 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,' that, and no more. But Jesus' demand was for an all-out offensive of goodwill.

This is one challenge at least which the Cross presents to us to-day. The field of its exercise is as wide as the world. Everywhere we look we see evidences of suspicion, bitterness, and hate.

Perhaps, however, it is in our own personal relations with others that we feel the cutting edge of this challenge most acutely. What is our normal reaction to injustices done to ourselves? The biographer of Stalin writes, 'Stalin never forgot nor forgave an injury done to him. He bided his time and in the end always hit back.' Compare with this the saying of Luther, 'My soul is too glad and too great to be at heart the enemy of any man.' Listen to the words of a great Christian Jew who had at one time been a specialist in hate. 'As God's own chosen, then, as consecrated and beloved, be clothed with compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and good-temper—forbear and forgive each other in any case of complaint; as Christ forgave you, so must you forgive. And above all you must be loving, for love is the link of the perfect life' (Moffatt). Paul had accepted this part of the challenge of the Cross.

A second challenge the Cross presents is the *necessity of self-identification with the sins and sufferings of humanity.* This was the hall-mark of all Christ's earthly life. Even the common people noticed it. They remarked on His resemblance to Jeremiah, whose heart, as they remembered, was stricken for the hurt of his people. On the Cross the full weight of our human

[1] R. Menzies, *The Riches of His Grace*, 146 ff. A review of this fine book of sermons will appear in the 'Literature' section in the April number.

burden was laid on His shoulders. There can be little doubt that the main element in His sufferings was their vicarious nature. Jowett speaks of 'desperate tides of the world's great anguish forced through the channels of a single heart.' If that is what the Cross meant to Jesus, then its perpetual challenge for us is that we should reproduce in our lives something of the same divine compassion and sympathy.

Paul in one passage in Colossians speaks of the Christian vocation as 'filling up that which is lacking in the sufferings of Christ,' as if in Christ's Passion there was something left which only we could implement. And in Philippians he declares it to be his ambition to know Christ and 'the fellowship of his sufferings.'

The challenge of the Cross must mean the extension of our personalities to the dimensions of an all-inclusive sympathy. Like Ezekiel in exile we must learn to say, 'I sat where they sat.' We shall never reach any success in Christian service till we 'are baptized into a feeling sense of all conditions.' This intense and extended sympathy is a primary requisite for all effective evangelical and missionary work.

The third challenge of the Cross *is a clarion call to endurance.* Have you ever envisaged to yourself what in terms of endurance the Cross meant for Christ? There was the Roman torture. The flagellum, as it was called, was a cruel thing. Many of its victims fainted, or went mad, or even died. On the top of that came the actual crucifying. 'He bare our sins in his own body on the tree.' On this Dr. Denney observes, 'Don't forget that the body was flesh and blood, and the tree was nails and timber.' He endured that long-drawn-out agony, and as if all that were not enough, there had to be added to it what the Scriptures call 'the reproach of the Cross.' There were the staring vulgar mob, the bespattering of His face with spittle, the wagging heads of the priest who mocked at His weakness, saying, 'He saved others, himself he cannot save.' It may be, as we are constantly reminded, that others besides Jesus had to endure the Cross. That is so, but none had to endure 'such contradiction of sinners against Himself.' And none endured with such patience and humility, and such victory over Himself. When Robertson of Brighton was told that his fearless advocacy of truth was alienating the ecclesiastical authorities, he said, 'I don't care.' When he was further reminded that he was outraging public sentiment he replied again, 'I don't care.' 'Do you know what happened to "Don't care?"' they continued. 'Yes,' he replied sorrowfully, 'He was crucified on Calvary.' Jesus with a kind of sublime recklessness seemed to disregard the consequences to Himself of the course He was pursuing. At all costs He must finish the work His Father gave Him to do.

Can we keep right on to the end of the road, without giving in, without compromising, or complaining, even if we meet opposition and apparent failure? Can we continue to work without reward, suffer without bitterness, and endure without retaliation? That is what the challenge of the Cross means in terms of endurance.

If we find it difficult or impossible let us take another long look at the Cross of our Lord. 'Just reflect,' in Dr. William Manson's words, 'what it meant for Him to face so courageously all that opposition of sinful men to Himself—that you may not grow faint and weary in your souls.' To keep close to the Cross is the only way to accept its challenge.

The last challenge of the Cross we shall mention is its *call to a life of self-renunciation.* All Christ's earthly life was a life of self-emptying. How excruciating the ordeal of the Cross was may be gathered from His bloody sweat in the Garden. That agony represents the violence of the struggle for the suppression of self. And when He reached the point of saying, 'Not my will but thine be done,' He registered not a meek submission to the inevitable, but a final and successful assault on the ramparts of His self-will. Everyone knows who has suffered great bodily pain how all-absorbing and self-demanding it can be. Yet Jesus, suspended on His Cross, tortured and racked with pain long drawn out, refused every palliative, asked for no one's sympathy, showed no signs of wounded pride nor weak self-pity. On the contrary, as He hung there, He was so completely detached from self, so objective in His outlook, that He was free to pray for His murderers, to offer salvation to a penitent malefactor, and to make provision for His mother's future. It was this total absence of self, and complete devotion to God's will that was the saving element in His atoning death.

Here is another great challenge the Cross binds upon us. It calls us to live no longer to ourselves but to Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Henry Drummond puts the matter plainly. 'The end of the Christian life is not to do good, nor to get good, nor even to be good. It is just to do what God wills, whether that be winning or losing, suffering or recovering, living or dying.'

'Are you able to drink this cup of which I am about to drink?' Shall our response not be this?

O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from Thee:
I lay in dust life's glory dead,
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

PALM SUNDAY

Decision

BY THE REVEREND STUART W. McWILLIAM, M.A., S.T.M., ABERDEEN

'If thou hadst known . . . the things which belong unto thy peace.'—Lk 19[42].

1. How very much easier life would be if we never had to make awkward and difficult decisions! But unfortunately for our peace of mind, though probably fortunately for the development of our character, life is not so amenable. However adept we may become in our evasions, however skilful at maintaining a nice but perilous balance, however much we may shuffle and try to compromise, there come these moments when life says 'Choose,' when we must, are compelled to, choose. This was the situation which faced Jerusalem on that first Palm Sunday. As long as Christ had kept away from Jerusalem the forces of the opposition could wait and watch and hope that something would happen, something which would relieve them of the necessity of taking action, the waverers could continue to waver, weighing the possibilities for and against. But this was a challenge, this entry into the capital, a challenge which could not be ignored. One can imagine the hurriedly called meetings of the Jerusalem Chamber of Commerce, the long sessions of the Church Committees, the hastily convened meetings of the Home Rule Party.

They did not want to take action. It was forced upon them. The initiative was with Christ. And you see the fact is that wherever and whenever Christ confronts a man or a woman, it means decision. We have this illustrated over and over again in the New Testament. There was Zacchæus mishandling his wealth, and the woman of Samaria mishandling her sex, and the rich young ruler trying to come to terms with his conscience. There was Peter at his nets and Matthew at his office desk and Paul on his mission for the Sanhedrin, Pilate in the seat of judgment and Herod on his throne. All of them were confronted by Christ and compelled to make a decision.

To all of us there come these moments and experiences in life where Christ confronts us and compels a decision. It may be in business—two possible lines of action, one good the other evil, and you have to make up your mind. At the moment of decision it is Christ who is confronting you. It may be in some domestic crisis. To a man and to his wife there comes a fateful choice upon which will depend the whole future of their life. And at that moment they are faced with the vital question of what they really do believe about life and about God. Even more simply it can happen that you are in a company where the conversation turns as it often does to religion and almost in a split second you have to decide what stand you are going to take. You cannot escape making a decision, for even if you remain silent you are taking one side or the other, and I believe that it is Christ who is facing you at that moment.

2. Secondly, the truly awful thing is that in the last resort the decision is always either to crown Christ or to crucify Him. It has been said that in every heart there is a throne and a cross and if Christ is not on the throne He is on the Cross. To crown Christ or to crucify Him? This in essence was the choice which confronted Jerusalem. Christ was too big a person to ignore. He had to be received and honoured as a king, or condemned as a criminal. Jerusalem made its choice and we make our choice, whether vocally or not it is no matter. May be you think that is hanging too much weight on the comparatively little choices we make from day to day. After all, to crucify Christ was a very big thing. We have no thought of doing anything so dreadful when we take the easy way out and choose evil instead of good. Well, let me tell you what happened in Jerusalem after that Palm Sunday.

The politicians made their choice. They made it on grounds of expediency. After all they wanted to keep the peace and Pilate's whole career was at stake, what did a little injustice matter if it was going to get them out of this mess without a major crisis.

The business men, the temple merchants made their choice—they made it on grounds of profit. This man was in danger of ruining a perfectly legitimate and highly prosperous commercial venture. The religious people made their choice and they made it on the grounds of tradition. Jesus was upsetting things. The common people made their choice. They made it as they so often made their choices, blinded by prejudice and emotion, whipped up to an almost hysterical patriotic fervour at the sight of Barabbas—brute and bully he might be but he was a true Jew every inch of him. And all these choices combined to form the one cry 'Crucify Him!'

Not what is right, but what is expedient. How often this seems to dictate the policies of nations. Does expediency never dictate our personal choices? This would be right, but not very wise at the moment! Are our choices never dictated by profit? 'May be it isn't very good religion,' one man said, 'but it is good business!'

Do we never set our faces against what would be for the advancement of the Kingdom of God because it will upset some cherished habit or tradition, and in the name of God crucify God?

Are we never so blinded by prejudice and unreasoning hatreds that we in effect demand that Barabbas should be freed and Christ crucified? You see it is this way. We crown Christ when we obey Him and serve Him and try to follow Him. We crucify Him when we disobey Him and follow not His will for us but our own selfish inclinations. To follow your choice, to be influenced by self rather than by God, is sin and the end of sin is Calvary—the end of all sins. And all our actions are finally governed by what someone has called our invisible attachments, and whether these attachments are to Christ or to the devil.

3. And, thirdly, the terrible thing is that when we turn our back on Christ, we turn our back on everything that is worth while. You remember that Palm Sunday how Christ stopped when He came in sight of Jerusalem, and He wept and cried, 'If only you had known the things that belonged to your peace.' And Jerusalem, in a sense for the sake of her peace, crucified Christ, and the fact is that Jerusalem never knew peace again. Pilate for the sake of the Roman Government crucified Christ and from that day to this his action stands out as Rome's greatest miscarriage of justice. He, whose sole purpose was to represent justice, crucified Christ and in so doing he denied the very grounds of his existence. Caiaphas was the representative of the religion which exalted God as supreme, as the true King of Israel. He crucified Christ, but before he did so he had to deny everything that was highest and best in the faith of his people and we have the pathetic spectacle of the High Priest of Israel saying, 'We have no king but Cæsar!' And the irony of it all is that Caiaphas, poor soul, thought he had got away with it, but three days after Christ was executed he had not one man to deal with but a Church, and three years later the thing had got beyond all control—there were thousands of men and women bearing the name of Christ. The merchants crucified Christ for the sake of their profits in the Temple trading and not many years later there was not even a Temple to trade in and they were eating one another in the grimmest, most terrible siege in history. The terrible thing about evil is not that it brings out the worst in you but that it destroys and wastes the highest and the best in you, all that deep down you would really wish to be you turn your back upon when you turn your back upon Christ. It is a strange thing that as men and as nations we never seem to learn that in choosing evil we are making the most shortsighted of choices. We never really get what we want and we always sacrifice the only things that can give life meaning and purpose.

Palm Sunday. Jerusalem was faced with a choice, an unavoidable choice. We, too, are faced with that same choice—to crown Christ or to crucify Him, not just to-day but every day. God grant us strength to choose aright.

Easter Day

Easter Comfort

By the Very Reverend George Johnstone Jeffrey, D.D., Glasgow

'God which raiseth the dead.'—2 Co 1[9].

There is a fine flash of insight here. An aspect of God's nature is revealed which to the hard-beset Apostle must have been very precious and comforting. Paul has been through the most frightening experience of a life-time. Only the truly brave are willing to confess to fear. 'We told ourselves this was the end' (Phillips). The dark ordeal he describes vaguely as 'our troubles which came to us in Asia.' But even to-day we read these verses with bated breath. The thing to remember is that when all seemed over, God miraculously intervened—the 'God which raiseth the dead'—so that the story ends in a pæan of faith in this same God 'who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver us: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us.' Having survived this horror of great darkness, Paul felt that nothing in the future could ever utterly overwhelm him.

'God which raiseth the dead.' There are several comforting implications in this power and habit of God.

1. The first is that we have here an explanation of *the permanence of the Christian Church*. The cynic's words are familiar to us all. 'The Christian Church *must* be a divine institution. No other could have survived so many crimes and errors.' But this taunt, like many others of its kind, is true in a far deeper sense than the cynic ever dreamed. When I am apt to lose heart regarding the alleged failure of the Church, I like to regale myself with a saying from the Confession of Faith which fortifies me with its stark realism and its staunch optimism. It reads—'The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error and some have so degenerated as to become no churches but synagogues of Satan. *Nevertheless, there will always be a church on earth to worship God according to His will.*' Whence this hardy confidence? To the mind of the critical outsider the Church is merely a human institution following a natural law. Just as artistic people come together, and musical people, so those who are interested in the things of the spirit come together. But we Christians believe that if that is all there is to the essential nature of the Church, then it would have perished long ago. We believe that

behind the Church is the Easter message. It is the Church *which is Christ's body*. Its one foundation, nay its very lifeblood is the risen, living, loving, eternal Christ, so that she will never perish nor will the gates of hell prevail against her. Thus, 'with all her faults we love her still.' Take out of life all that the Church presents to us—its worship, its music, its sacramental table, its call to penitence and adoration and intercession, its implications of eternity—and life becomes one vast secularization, emptying it of greatness and dignity and reducing it to a plane but little above the temporal and the animal. Surely then there is no time more fitting than Easter-tide to sing, and sing from the heart,

I love Thy Church, O God;
Her walls before Thee stand,
Dear as the apple of Thine eye,
And graven on Thy hand.

For her my tears shall fall,
For her my prayers ascend,
To her my cares and toils be given,
Till toils and cares shall end.

2. 'God which raiseth the dead.' Let us return to the context for another source of comfort. From this dread encounter Paul emerged as one alive from the dead. A new vision of God's inexhaustible resources was disclosed to him that gave him confidence for life. It was out of such trials that he was able to compose such a crescendo of trust as this. 'God is able—able to do, able to do all, able to do above all, able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us.' Such was the faith that was born of despair. Do *we* know such faith?

There are seasons familiar to us all when dark clouds of unbelief hang heavy over our souls. Prayer ceases to be a privilege and becomes a task. We sit in the house of God and know that we have brought the body only and left the soul. We sit unreceptive, dull and dead at heart. Or the sorrows that come to us all settle like a pall over our days. We ask ourselves—'Where is thy God?' Yet we would be false to memory and bankrupt in gratitude if we did not remember how often these dark clouds broke in blessings on our heads. In his searching and beautiful book, *The Spirit of Discipline*, Francis Paget lets us see the clouds lifting and the sun breaking through. He speaks of 'days when some great sorrow, or anxiety, or mood of sadness passes from our hearts, *and we re-discover the reality of joy*, when some chastening dimness of faith, it may be, is taken away, and the light and love of God seem clearer, closer to us than ever, when the long days of sickness are forgotten in the new gladness of returning health.' The poet has enshrined for us the exquisite joys of convalescence.

See the wretch that long hath tossed
On the thorny bed of pain
At length repair his vigour lost
And breathe and walk again.

The meanest floweret of the vale,
The simplest note that swells the gale,
The common sun, the air, the skies
To him are opening Paradise.

Do these things happen in the realm of Nature only and are they unknown in the world of grace? It were good for us, oftener than we do, to take a turn up and down in our past years and recount the endless occasions when God, in His mercy, turned our darkness into light, our captivity into deliverance, and our mourning into a song. And will God change His habits with us? The Easter message is our answer of hope.

3. But it would be only toying with our theme were we to omit its most precious application. '*You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins.*' On this austere phrase our inner lives write their own commentary. Looking back on a slothful and undisciplined period of his life, Dr. Johnson exclaimed with an accent of heart-break—'This is not the life to which heaven is promised.' Well we know how life sags and loses its savour when we are guilty of the presumptuous sin of functioning without God. Almost gaily we leave the highway of duty. We refuse the challenging right and choose the glamorous wrong. Life becomes a vast entanglement from which we strive in vain to escape.

But thank God this is not the end of the story. Our whole experience of the pardoning love of God in Christ Jesus is a shining record of supernatural restorations, reinstatements, and deliverances. Shall we not humbly confess that if there is in us any humility or any spirituality at all, it is only because of these Divine interventions? In a recent, powerful broadcast, Dr. A. C. Craig vividly describes this aspect of our life unto God. 'Death-resurrection, death-resurrection, death-resurrection, repeated over and over again, that is the mystery of the rhythm of the life in Christ. Resurrection out of pride, which is in very truth, "rigor mortis" and the precursor of all kinds of corruptions, into candour and simplicity, resurrection from the graves of narrowness and suspicion and jealousy and hate into all the breadths and depths of love, in a word, from corruption and death, for these things *are* corruption and death, into the risen life of the worship of God and the love of our brethren.'

'The love of our brethren.' The Easter message is not like a bloodless problem in geometry or an exercise for the acute intellects of scholars and theologians. *It is warm with life.* It sends us forth to love and to serve. All down the ages men have troubled themselves with the question of their assurance of God's forgiveness. In the Gospel of John there is laid down the final and absolute test of such assurance. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' Or in the luminous words of Robertson of Brighton: 'If ever you devoted yourself to another's happiness or amelioration, so far and so long as you were doing *that*, you forgave yourself.' Such is the great enfranchisement that Easter brings to troubled souls. 'You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins'—quickened to serve, with an exulting assurance in which past failures and regrets and humiliations die the death, and a new quality of life is ushered in—a life where 'love is an unerring light, and joy its own security.'

Recent Foreign Theology

Calvin and History. In the Swiss series of *Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie* Dr. H. Berger has published a monograph on Calvin's conception of history.[1] It is impossible here to mention the variety of facets of Calvin's thought and teaching which are here surveyed. A few pages are devoted to his polemic against the cult of saints and against images; his polemic against the Papacy and contention that it was to be identified with Antichrist receive fuller treatment. The idea that the Papacy was Antichrist is older than the Reformation, indeed, but its adoption by the Reformers gave it a currency which still lasts in some quarters. Calvin's conception of the Church and of its place in a world whose ruler was held to be Satan, though its ultimate Ruler would be seen to be God, manifesting His authority supremely in the final Judgment, is carefully examined; similarly his view of the Reformation as a return to primitive Christianity, and as the work of God. The whole is of great interest as a historical study. The forthrightness of the old controversies is best understood in the light of the conditions that called them forth, and if the lines are softer in the modern world and controversy less bitter, that is in part the fruit of the controversies. In days of ecumenicity it is well to remember the hard fighting of earlier days, not in order to revive its spirit, but in order to ensure that its gains be not lost.

The Theology of Ebrard. In the same series of *Studien* Dr. Paul Jacobs offers an examination of the main ideas of the theology of J. H. A. Ebrard,[2] the nineteenth-century Reformed theologian and critic of Strauss, who occupied Chairs successively at Zürich and Erlangen. The present study is confined to Ebrard's views on the human will in man's unregenerate and redeemed state, and more particularly to his teaching on the age-old question of freewill as against predestination. Here, as so often, when either is pressed to extremes and elevated as the sole explanation of the mysteries of life, difficulties are encountered, and truth lies in a tension between them. In his views on the new birth in Christ and the renewal of the personality in union with Christ, the pietistic strain in Ebrard's thought comes out. In the final section of the study, the author endeavours to estimate the place of Ebrard in the history of theology, and especially in relation to the far more influential figure of Schleiermacher and to Schweizer.

Dogmatic Prolegomena. A third volume in the same series comes from the pen of H. van Oyen, and it contains what the author describes as the prolegomena to Dogmatics.[3] In a substantial work of nearly two hundred and fifty pages, he begins by defining his terms and indicating the relation of theology to religion, dogma and apologetic, after which he considers the revelation in Christ as the revelation of God's love, the significance of this for man whose old self can become the new man in Christ, and the work of the Holy Spirit. As has been said, this is only prolegomena, and there is no attempt here to unfold the character of God, the Person and Work of Christ, or the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. All that we have here is the setting of the field for the fuller study of the doctrines which constitute Christian theology—God as the source of the revelation, Christ as the medium of the supreme revelation, man as the receiver of the revelation, not as knowledge alone but as life, transforming and enriching his whole being, and the Holy Spirit as the continuer of the work of Christ in the heart, and the maintainer of the new life given to man in Christ. Professor van Oyen is a colleague of Karl Barth in Basel, and perhaps

[1] *Calvins Geschichtsauffassung* [1955]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 14.

[2] *Wille und Wandlung* [1955]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 10.

[3] *Theologische Erkenntnislehre: Versuch dogmatischer Prolegomena* [1955]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 13.95.

on that account contents himself with the prolegomena, while Barth issues the succession of large volumes in which his view of Christian Dogmatics is set forth.

The Existentialism of Gabriel Marcel. Still in the same series we have a study of a contemporary thinker. F. Hoefeld is the author and Gabriel Marcel the subject of the study, which is entitled *The Christian Existentialism of Gabriel Marcel.*[1] Marcel was born in 1889, and the works which form the basis of the present study appeared between 1927 and 1951. Their background is to be found in the work of the existentialist philosophers from Kierkegaard on, but, unlike some forms of existentialism, Marcel's is theistic. His father had abandoned Catholicism for agnostic rationalism, but he himself moved from rationalism to Catholicism, which he embraced in 1929. Already before this, in 1927, in his *Journal métaphysique* he had sought to defend the Christian faith as against rationalism. In the present work, after an examination of the method and approach of Marcel, we are given a systematic study of his fundamental conception of the nature of man and his relation to the world and to time, of his views on Love, Faith and Hope, and of his ideas about God. After this exposition of the teaching of Marcel there follows a criticism of its presuppositions and content, and a good bibliography of works dealing not alone with Marcel, but with the existentialist approach in general.

Hamann Studies. Yet a fifth volume in the same series comes from the pen of Professor F. Blanke, of Zürich, one of the editors of the series. It consists of a series of papers, all related to J. G. Hamann,[2] which have already seen the light in different places, and whose collection here is to be welcomed. Hamann, who was born in Königsberg in 1730, came to England when he was twenty-seven years old, and spent sixteen months here. The story of his life in London, and the influences under which he came there, may be found in one of the later studies in this book—though one would have expected the chapter on 'The Young Hamann' to precede the studies of 'Hamann as Theologian' and of 'Hamann and Luther' and 'Hamann and Lessing.' Although at one stage in his varied career he owed his appointment to Kant, he was an opponent of the Kantian philosophy. He exercised an important influence in his own day, and the Princess Gallitzin was converted by his writings four years before his death in 1788. The last study in the present work is devoted to this episode. In some ways he must have been a strange genius, and he was known as 'the Magus of the north'—*i.e.*, of Königsberg, where he lived after his return from England, until, towards the end of his life, his position was eased financially by a friend in Westphalia, where he died. He has been linked with Kierkegaard as a prophet of irrationalism.

Ῥῆμα in the New Testament. In 1951 the Finnish scholar Eero Repo issued a study of the word ῥῆμα in the Septuagint, as the first part of an examination of its use in Biblical Greek. He has now followed this up with the sequel, which covers the New Testament, the Apostolic Fathers and some apocryphal books, and a number of the Early Christian Fathers down to Eusebius.[3] Each of the New Testament and other writers is treated separately first, with statistical information as to the relative frequency of the use of ῥῆμα and λόγος, and then a synthetic study follows. In the earlier study he found that in the Septuagint ῥῆμα reflected the Jewish background of the translators, and here he finds that in the New Testament it shows the same Semitic influence, while in the later writers it is rather an archaism that rests on the Septuagint.

Two New Testament Studies. In the Louvain series of *Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia* two new issues have appeared, both devoted to New Testament questions. In the first C. Spicq examines the meaning of ἀγάπη in 1 Co 13,[4] and shows that it is love of one's neighbour, and that it springs from participation in God's love for men. St. Paul inculcates a union with God which is not an egocentric mysticism, but which fills a man with the spirit of self-forgetting service for others.

In the second study, L. Cerfaux examines the Biblical sources of Mt 11^{25-30}, and shows that they are to be found in Daniel and in Deutero-Isaiah.[5] He finds no reason to suppose that they rest on the Fourth Gospel, and none to deny them to Jesus. The speaker is one who is both Son of Man and Suffering Servant, and who draws from the Old Testament and not from Hellenistic sources.

H. H. Rowley
Manchester University.

---

[1] *Der christliche Existenzialismus Gabriel Marcels* [1956]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 14.

[2] *Hamann-Studien* [1956]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Fr. 16.

[3] *Der Begriff 'Rhēma' im Biblisch-Griechischen: eine traditions geschichtliche und semasiologische Untersuchung:* II. *'Rhēma' im Neuen Testament, unter Berücksichtigung seines Gebrauchs in der übrigen altchristlichen Literatur* [1954]. Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, Helsinki; Mk. 800.

[4] *L'Agapè de I Cor. XIII.* [1955]. Publications Universitaires de Louvain; Fr. 25.

[5] *Les sources scripturaires de Mt. XI* 25–30 [1955]; Fr. 25.

Entre Nous

Reading and Preaching with Understanding

We cannot have too many books designed to enable us better to understand the Bible, and better to communicate the truth which we have understood to others. Dr. F. C. Grant has given us a most useful book entitled *How to Read the Bible* (Morehouse-Gorham, New York; $2.50). There is a sense in which any one can read the Bible and interpret it for himself. In Adolf Harnack's great days a rumour got about Berlin that Harnack had said that 'no one in Berlin understands the Bible except the great Professor Harnack.' Harnack publicly answered: 'Many a chambermaid in this vast city, reading her Bible at her bedside after a long day's work, understands the Bible far better than the great Professor Harnack.' Nevertheless no one can approve the spirit of the young lady, who, after an address, rose and said: 'You don't need some one to tell you how to read the Bible. Open it anywhere, read three verses, make your mind a blank, and the Holy Spirit will do the rest'! Philip Melanchthon was much nearer the truth when he said: 'Every good theologian and faithful interpreter of heavenly doctrine must of necessity be first a grammarian, then a dialectician (weighing different possible interpretations), finally a witness.' When Streeter was asked for advice on *devotional* study of the Bible, he replied: 'The accurate, painstaking, critical study of the Bible is its devotional study. For the first thing to inquire of scripture is its *meaning*. What could be more important for its devotional interpretation and application than this?' As Bengel had it long ago: 'Apply thyself wholly to the text, then apply the whole to thyself' (*Te totum applica ad textum: rem totam applica ad te*).

Dr. Grant has most excellent chapters on how to read the various sections of the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the various sections of the New Testament. But the book would have been more than worth writing for the sake of the five principles he lays down in the first chapter. (1) *The Bible is the Church's book*, written, preserved, copied, canonized, read publicly, and expounded by the Church for the Church's purposes of worship and instruction. (2) *The Bible is intended to be read aloud.* In point of fact the ancient peoples always read aloud, or at least formed the words with their lips. 'As a matter of historical fact, it is as a *liturgical* book that the Bible has been preserved and handed down through the centuries.' (3) *Much of the Bible is poetry* and must be understood as such. Poetry, said Aristotle, is different, in that it is 'more philosophical and more serious than history.' (4) *Most of the Bible is traditional.* In the Old Testament there are the cycles of tradition; and the New Testament material of the Gospels was used for preaching and for missionary purposes long before it was ever written down. (5) *The great over-ruling interest of the Bible is religion.*

Dr. Grant is a distinguished professor. The Rev. Frank W. Moyle is a parish priest, and he has presented us with a most vital and interesting book entitled *About the Bible* (Bles; 16s. net). He takes the different sections of the Bible, and expounds them in the light of the most recent knowledge and scholarship, but in a way in which the scholarship is always unobtrusive and yet illuminating, and understandable by the simplest person. For instance, he interprets Ruth and Jonah in the light of the exclusiveness which entered Jewish thought on the return from the Exile, and shows that they are counterblasts against it. Often in a phrase Mr. Moyle throws an illuminating flood of light. John Donne called the book of Psalms 'the Manna of the Church.' The Psalms 'minister instruction and satisfaction to every man in every emergency and occasion.' 'If H. G. Wells had read the 46th, he might not have uttered his last despairing cry, "Mind at the end of its tether."' Ecclesiastes is 'The Confessions of an Adventurous Soul.' The Sermon on the Mount is 'The Spring Song of the New World.' 'There is always one more important question than "Do you believe in God?" and that is, "What kind of God do you believe in?"' He has a most interesting modernization of the last verses of Ecclesiastes, whom he calls The Professor, under the headings *Our Phrases*, and *Those of the Professor*. 'The old man is pretty shaky on his pins'—'When the guards tremble in the house of life, when its beholders bow.' 'He's a toothless old man'—'The maids that grind are few and fail.' 'His eyes are bleary'—'Ladies at the lattice lose their lustre.' 'He's deaf as a post'—'The doors to the street are shut, and the sound of the mill runs low.' 'He gets giddy'—'Old age fears a height, and even a walk has its terrors.' 'He died'—'The silver cord is snapped . . . the wheel breaks at the cistern.' This is a book written by a man who is really excited about the Bible, and his excitement will penetrate to others.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.